



144
144

Library of the Theological Seminary,
PRINCETON, N. J.

Presented by Mr. Samuel Agnew of Philadelphia, Pa.

Division

Section

Number

SCC
8386

Baptist pamphlets. 55.



Published by the same AUTHOR.

THE
BAPTISM
OF
INFANTS,
A
Reasonable Service;

Founded upon SCRIPTURE, and undoubted
APOSTOLIC TRADITION:

In which

It's Moral Purposes and Use in Religion are shewn.

Printed for *J. Waugh*, at the *'Turk's-Head, Lombard-Street.*

3

PÆDO-BAPTISM:

O R, A

D.D.
95

D E F E N C E

O F

I N F A N T-B A P T I S M,

In Point of

ANTIQUITY.

Against the

E X C E P T I O N S

O F

John Brekell

Dr. JOHN GILL, and OTHERS.

by Michael Tongood -

Baptizandos esse parvulos nemo dubitet; quando nec illi
hinc dubitant, qui ex parte aliquâ contradicunt.

Augustin. de Verb. ap. Serm. 14.

L O N D O N:

Printed for J. WAUGH at the Turk's-Head in Lombard-
Street. MDCCLXIIII.

THEATRUM MUNDI



PÆD O - BAPTISM:
OR, A
D E F E N C E
O F
INFANT - BAPTISM, &c;

S E C T I O N I.

A general View of the Argument.



HEN God gave to *Abraham* the *Covenant of Circumcision* [a], this religious Rite was administred, upon the ground of his own faith [b], to all the males, i. e. all the capable members of his family, from

eight days old and upwards, according to their several and respective ages [c]: *Abraham* himself being ninety years old and nine when he was circumcised, *Ishmael*, his son, thirteen years old, &c [d]. But, for the future, the appointed time of Circumcision, in ordinary, was the eighth day from the birth; excepting the case of new Proselytes, e. g. the *Schemites* [e], and others, whose families were circumcised together, as *Abraham's* had been [f]. In like manner, when the *Covenant of Baptism* [g] was given to the Christian Church, it seems very natural to suppose, that this sacred rite also was administered to persons of every age both old and young. For, *Christian* baptism came in the room of Circumcision, so as to supersede it [h]; and we find, at the beginning of the Gospel Dispensation, whole *households* baptized together [i], as *Abraham's* household had been circumcised together. (though there is no express mention of any young children being *then* admitted to the ordinance, in the one case more than in the other.) But, it is *analogous* to think, that the usual time of administering baptism, afterwards, (excepting here again the Case of new Proselytes) was in the state of Infancy.

Because,

[c] Gen. xvii. 23.

[d] Gen. xvii. 24, 25.

[e] Gen. xxxiv. 24. [f] Gen. xvii. 23. [g] 1 Pet. iii. 21.

[h] By *christian baptism* I mean baptism, as administered in the *christian church*, commencing after the death of Christ, whereby circumcision &c, was vacated.

[i] Acts xvi. 15, 33. 1 Cor. i. 16.

Because, there is no particular direction in the Gospel to defer baptism ordinarily even to the eighth day from the birth, and much less beyond it, and least of all to riper years ; and therefore it might well be judged lawful and expedient before. However, in this light the matter hath always appeared to me, and I believe to most other men.

Nevertheless, as the sacred History often speaks of adult baptism (which, as every one must perceive, was a thing unavoidable at the first institution of christian baptism, even supposing, not only that children also were to be baptized, but that baptism, as a standing ordinance in the *christian* church, like circumcision in the *Jewish* church, was chiefly designed for children) I say, because the sacred writings of the new Testament make frequent mention of adult baptism, without expressly naming the baptism of children ; this hath lead some persons to conclude, that none, but the adult were, or ought to be baptized. Now, this, I imagine, is to turn an *accidental circumstance* into a standing rule, as the descendants of *Ishmael* did, who circumcised not their children before the 13th year of their age, because *Ishmael* himself happened to be so old, when he was circumcised, at the time of the first institution of the rite of circumcision [k]. And, if the *Ishma-*

elites could commit such a mistake, as to the time of administering circumcision, contrary to an express command, fixing it to the eighth day ; it is possible that others might fall into a like error about the time of admitting persons to baptism, though the proofs for *Infant-baptism* in the *christian church*, were as clear, and strong, as the evidence for *Infant-circumcision* in the *Jewish church*. It is therefore no sufficient ground of prejudice, or objection, against *Infant-baptism*, if some persons dislike, or disuse it ; especially when it shall be considered, how many *more*, on the other side, have declared for it, and *how long* it hath been practised in the *christian church*.

The *Antiquity* of this practice is the Subject of our present Enquiry. And here again, so far as I am able to judge, want of attention to the state and circumstances of persons and things, in the Primitive Church, hath proved the cause of error and deception. For, it was by *degrees* that the *christian religion* gained ground in the world ; and so, from time to time, *new Converts* came over to the *christian church*, and, by consequence, adult baptisms were very common of course in the earlier ages. But, to conclude from *hence*, as some persons would do, that *Infant-baptism* was not in use at that time, is evidently a wrong conclusion. For, it by no means follows, that *Infants* were not ordinarily bapti-
zed

zed in those days, only because adult persons, not born of christian parents, were admitted to baptism. The Antipedo-baptists themselves vouchsafe, to grant " that Infant-baptism " began to spread in the third century, and " generally prevailed in the fourth [l]." And yet during that period, there are some remarkable instances, and examples of adult baptism. 'Tis true ; these cases have been mistaken, and misrepresented. For, the persons, so baptized, were not born of baptized christian parents, as some have supposed, and upon that supposition denied the general use of Infant-baptism in the first ages of the christian church. The pretence, I own, was very plausible at the first, and before the matter of fact came to be critically examined by the light of history. To read, or to hear, that such eminent and illustrious personages, as *Constantine*, *Constantius*, *Gratian*, *Theodosius* the first, &c. were not baptized in their infancy ; this, upon a slight and superficial view, might be apt, to raise a strong suspicion, that Infant-baptism was a thing little known, or practised, at the time of their nativity. But, upon a particular examination of these and the like instances, it appears, that most, if not all of them relate to persons, whose

[l] " Infant-Baptism was moved for in the third Century ; " got footing, and establishment in the fourth and fifth ; and " so prevailed until the time of the Reformation." *Dr. Gill, The Divine Right of Inf. Bapt. examined, &c. p. 24.*

whose parents (one, or both) at the time of their birth, were not *baptized Christians* themselves [m]. Consequently, no argument can be drawn, or *pertinently urged*, from such examples, to disprove the constant use of Infant-baptism, in relation to the children of professed christians. A single exception, or two, if any such be found, cannot be thought of sufficient force, to set aside a general rule, or to prove a contrary custom; especially considering that a delay of baptism, in some cases, may be otherwise accounted for, without supposing Infant-baptism not to have been generally practised in the same period.

This Point, I presume, hath been cleared up by other hands, particularly by the useful labours of Dr. *Wall*; to the conviction of the most judicious and learned Antipedo-baptists themselves; because, they are now silent upon this head. There is, I confess, one *Norcot* (to say nothing of others [n]) who hath again made a flourish with these great names in a book called, *Believer's Baptism displayed* [o]. But, he hath *displayed* little wisdom, or modesty in so doing. His leader seems to have been Colonel *Danvers* that noted

[m] See *Wall's Hist. of Infant-Baptism*. Part. 2. Ch. 3.

[n] Some of the more illiterate among the Antipedo-baptists are often haranguing upon the same subject, both in public, and private.

[o] See his Postscript.

ted romancer [p]. In short, all the instances, referred to before, have been shewed to be nothing to the purpose, excepting one only, and that a dubious one at the most; viz. the case of *Gregory Nazianzen*; at the time of whose birth, that his father, (though afterwards a Bishop) was a christian, is far from being certain [q]. The general stream of history would prove the contrary, but for one single passage in his life, writ by himself [r]; which therefore hath puzzled all the Critics. So that that the learned Dr. *Wall* could find no way, to reconcile it with historical truth, but by supposing a *corruption* of the text, and offering an emendation [s]. But, as I am not fond of such expedients, I would humbly propose another method of removing the difficulty, e. g. *thus*: When *Gregory Nazianzen's*

C

[p] Dr. *Wall* hath given his character. Hist. of Inf. Bap. Part 2. ch. 2.

[q] That *Greg. Nazianzen's* father was once a Heathen, appears from what himself says of him. De Vitâ suâ.

[r] Οὐτω̄ τοσχον ἐκμετρηκας βιον,

Οσος διηλθε̄ θυσιῶν ἐμοὶ χρόνος. i. e.

Nondum tot anni sunt tui, quot jam in facie

Mihi sunt peracti victimis. —

[s] " If one were to amend by the sense without any book, or manuscript, I should think that θυσιῶν has crept in by mistake for πολιῶν, &c. — You are not so old, as my gray hairs are, — is to the purpose of the Father's argument at that place." Hist. of Inf. Bap. p. 2. ch. 3. sect. 5. Edit. 3. It will yield as congruous a sense, if, for θυσιῶν, we read φυσιῶν' a participle agreeing with ἐμοὶ, which is an easier correction. φυσιῶν, ἀφυσιῶν, πνευσιῶν. Hesych. Thus, the sense will be, I have been troubled with an asthma before you was born.

zen's father speaks of the *time of sacrifices*, he might refer, not to the time when himself was made a Bishop, (which probably was at a very advanced age, as he was a heathen in his younger days) but to what was the most usual time, in those days, of Bishops entering upon their office ; and this, according to the *Constitutions* [t], was at fifty years of age, though that rule was not always observed [u]. Thus then, the good old Bishop, urging his son to assist him in his weighty charge, may be conceived, to tell him, among other Arguments, " that he had survived (the commencement of) the Episcopal age, more years than his son had lived :" and not, that his son had not lived so many years, as himself had been a Bishop, according to the Latin translation.—I submit this remark to the judgment of the critical, and candid Reader. And if, after all, it shall not appear of sufficient weight and force, to serve the purpose intended ; yet, from the single instance of *Gregory Nazianzen*, no argument can be drawn (as I hinted before) to disprove the general practice of Infant-baptism in that age ; for, by the confession of Antipedo-baptists themselves, it generally prevailed in the fourth Century. But, that it

then

[t] *Constit. Apost.* lib. 2. cap. 1.

[u] *See Bingham. Antiq. of the Chr! Ch.* B. 2. Ch. 10. S. 1.

then first began to prevail, or received it's establishment, as is pretended [w]; this is a mere presumption, without any historical proof, as I hope to shew in the Sequel, by considering the practice of the primitive church, with reference to *Infant-Baptism*; in the time of St. *Augustin*, and from thence tracing it back to the first ages of all ††.

S E C T I O N II.

A View of Infant-Baptism in the fourth Century.

IN order to fix the *antiquity*, and trace back the original, of Infant-Baptism, we shall begin at the time of St. *Augustin*, who

C 2

flou-

[w] See Dr. Gill, *ubi supra*.

†† The order of *Catechumens* in the primitive Church has been alledged as a proof, that Infant-Baptism was not practised in these days. But this can be no proof at all. For that order subsisted in the time of St. *Austin*: [Vid. *Augustin de Fide Catechumen, &c.*] when Infant-Baptism, as its opponents acknowledge, was in common use. The truth is, the order of *Catechumens*, (properly so called, viz. those who were instructed in the Christian religion to prepare them for baptism,) were not persons born of baptized Christian Parents, but such, (or their children) as *relinquished Paganism, and came over to the Christian faith*: as Lord King observes. [Enquiry into the Constitution, &c. of the Primitive Church. P. 2. Ch. 3. S. 3. Compare the learned Beza's note on 1 Cor. vii. beginning.]

flourished about the end of this century, and in whose days the practice of Pædo-baptism did confessedly prevail. But, when it is pretended, that it was chiefly owing to his influence, and authority, that it did so generally prevail, either then or afterwards [x]; this pretence is a contradiction both to history and to common sense. For, St. *Augustin* himself speaks of it, as the *antient* practice of the *universal* church [y]. And how could he be so rash and stupid, as to affirm such a thing, if Infant-Baptism was generally known in his days, to be a *novel*, or late invention, which owed it's *establishment* to himself? Let me farther observe, when the *Pelagians* were strongly pressed with an argument, in proof of Original Sin, from Infant-baptism; they never denied it to be an apostolical institution, or the perpetual practice of the christian church; which, being the shortest way to get clear of the difficulty, they would undoubtedly have taken it, if they had any ground for such a pretence, as they must have had according to the modern hypothesis of our Antipædo-baptists. Their hypothesis therefore is groundless and absurd. For any one to say, that the *Pelagians* durst not deny

[x] See *Tambes Examen.* p. 12.

[y] Ut antiquitus universa Ecclesia pertineret fideles parvulos originalis peccati remissionem per Christi baptismum consecutos. *Augustin cont. Pelag. lib. 3.*

deny Infant-Baptism [z], is an idle conceit, and plainly saying nothing, for want of having something to say. For, what *durst* not *they* do, who had the courage, to deny Original Sin? which was generally considered, at that time, and strenuously urged, as the ground, and reason of Infant-Baptism; so that upon this very score they were charged with denying Infant-Baptism, as a consequence of their denying Original Sin, but they disowned the charge; and acknowledged the necessity of Infant-Baptism, though upon a different ground [a]. It was not therefore, for want of *courage*; for, they were *men of mettle*; but for want of *evidence*, that the *Pelagians* did not deny Infant-Baptism. The plain truth of the matter then is, they *could not* deny it. But, the fact itself is enough for our purpose, viz. that the *Pelagians did not* deny Infant-Baptism [b], when the fairest opportunity was offered, and they had the strongest temptation to deny it, if they could have done it consistently with honour and truth. This appears to me an unanswerable argument, that the practice of Infant-Baptism was far from being a *new* thing, or looked upon as a *human invention*, in those days, but, on the contrary, was considered, on *all* sides, as a divine institution, and the in-

moni

[z] *Tombes Examen*, P. 2. Sect. 2.

[a] *Vid. Hieronym. advers. Pelag. lib. 3. sub. fin.*

[b] *Vid. G. J. Voss. Hist. Pelag. lib. 2. par. 2. Thes. 4.*

morial practice of the christian church [c]. It is an argument which I suspect the Anti-pædo-baptists do not care to look in the face; and, though the celebrated Dr. Gill hath been lately forced to attack it, or give up the cause; we shall presently see, that it stands firm against all his artillery.

One method taken to invalidate the force of this argument, is alledging *other Ecclesiastical customs*, which prevailed as generally in the primitive church, as Infant-Baptism, under the notion of *unwritten traditions*; and yet are not held by us to be apostolical institutions. But before any great execution can be done this way, it must be first shewn, that the said Ecclesiastical customs have the same evidence from the *testimony* of the antients for their apostolical institution; that they were put to the same *test* with Infant-Baptism, to try their true antiquity and authority; and that they *stood* the trial, as Infant-Baptism did. For, if these things cannot be made to appear, 'tis evidently not *right*, but very wrong, to put them upon the same foot, as if we were equally obliged to receive the one, as the other, that we may preserve the character of *honest* men [d]. But more of this matter hereafter. At present I shall apply myself to a par-

[c] See this argument well urged. The Baptism of Infants a Reasonable Service. Arg. 5.

[d] See Dr. Gill's Remarks on the Bap. of Inf. a Reas. Serv. p. 27.

a particular, and distinct consideration of all, that Dr. *Gill* hath advanced, in order to evade the force of our argument, as stated above.

1. Says the Doctor, “ However embarrassed *Pelagius* might be with the argument, it did not lead to a controversy about the *subject*, but the *end* of baptism, and about the latter, not the former *was* the dispute. [e].” Very well! then both sides were agreed about the *subject* of baptism. However, the dispute with the *Pelagians* did *in fact* lead to a controversy about the *subject* of baptism, so far as that they were actually pressed, and even teased with an argument from Infant-Baptism; as the learned Doctor cannot but know. And how easy a matter had it been for them, to crush this argument at once, and get clear of it for ever, without any more ado, only by denying Infant-Baptism, if they could have denied it with a safe conscience? I appeal to the Doctor himself, whether this was not the shortest way, and the most effectual method, to silence all his opponents. This may serve, as a proper answer to what follows [f]. “ Nor was he under so great a temptation, and much less necessity, nor did it so greatly concern him to deny the baptism of Infants, on account of his tenet; since he was able upon his principles to point out other ends of their baptism,

“ baptism, than that of remission of sin ; and
 “ particularly their receiving, and enjoying
 “ the kingdom of heaven, &c.” There is
 nothing in all this, that affects our argument,
 in the least. We readily grant, that *Pelagius*
 was not obliged by his principles to deny
 Infant-Baptism. On the contrary, we affirm,
 and maintain, that he neither did, nor could
 deny it. But, what we urge is this, that, when
 he was vehemently pressed with an argument
 from Infant-Baptism in proof of original sin, In-
 fant-Baptism was considered as a *medium* al-
 lowed on both sides, and it is what *Pelagius*
 never disputed, when he had a fair *occasion*
 given him to deny it, if he could have done
 it with any appearance of modesty, reason,
 and truth.—The Doctor proceeds.

2. [g] “ It should be known, and observ-
 “ ed, that we have no writings of *Pelagius*
 “ extant, &c.”—But, where is the use, or
 importance of *knowing and observing* this, in
 the present case, when Dr. Gill doth not de-
 ny “ that he hath been used fairly, and is
 “ willing to allow his (i. e. *Austin's*) authori-
 “ ties.” Why, it is here, that we join issue
 with him ; for, it is only upon such evidence,
 as we *have*, that we can proceed, in deciding
 any controverted point of this nature. If the
 Doctor can produce any better ; we are ready
 to attend to it. But he goes on thus,

3. “ How-

3. [b] "However acute, learned, and sagacious *Pelagius* was, yet falling in with the *stream of the times*, and not seeing himself concerned about the *subjects*, but the *end* of baptism, might give himself no trouble to enquire into the rise of it; but take it for granted, as *Austin* did, — that it had been the constant usage of the church, and an apostolic tradition." — Upon which it is obvious to remark. (1.) We have here a fair concession that the *stream of the times* ran in favour of Infant-Baptism, as the *constant usage of the church, and an apostolic tradition*, in the days of *Austin*; and of *Pelagius*, who began in the year 400 to teach his errors at *Rome*, as says *Dupin* [i]. (2.) That *Pelagius* should fall in with the *stream of the times*, whatever *Austin* might do, is highly improbable. Nor can it be supposed that *Austin* himself acted in this manner, without granting at the same time, that the practice of Infant-Baptism was a prevailing custom before he came into play, which therefore could not be owing to his influence, and authority [k]. For, though we allow him to be a very acute man; yet surely he could not be the author of such an ingenious contrivance, as first to raise the *stream of the times*, and then suffer himself to be carried away with it. But, in

D respect

[b] *Ibid.* p. 21. [i] *Hist. Eccles.* [k] See *Waltz's Answer to Gale*, p. 427.

respect to *Pelagius*, I say, it is highly improbable that he should fall in with the stream of the times, and take the thing, in question, for granted without examination. So that there is no weight, or force in the Doctor's suggestion, viz. " that *Pelagius* might give " himself no trouble to enquire into the rise " of Infant-Baptism." For, we are not enquiring into mere *possibilities*, but *probabilities*, and facts. And whatever *Austin* was, it is certain that *Pelagius* was not of that temper, and complexion, as to fall in with the stream of the times. Witness his open opposition to the vulgar doctrine of original sin. In this case *Pelagius* went *against* the stream of the times, and particularly against *Austin* himself, whether at the head, or in the midst of the stream. (3.) If *Pelagius* saw himself no ways concerned about the subjects, but the end of baptism; as Dr. *Gill* says; this implies, that Infant-Baptism was no point of controversy between him, and his opponents. It was a point in which both sides were fully agreed; otherwise, when he was urged with an argument from Infant-Baptism, he might have dispatched it at once, and struck all his adversaries dumb, by denying Infant-Baptism; as, I am persuaded, Dr. *Gill*, or any other skilful disputant, would have done in the same case; and *Pelagius* appears to have been a man of sufficient sagacity, I add

of

of spirit too, not to have let slip such an advantage.—But let us attend the *Doctor*.

4. “Tho’ *Pelagius* complained, that he
“ was defamed, and slandered by some, who
“ charged him with denying Infant-Baptism ;
“ yet this, *Austin* observes, was only a shift
“ of his, in order to invert the state of the
“ question, that he might more easily an-
“ swer to what was objected to him, and pre-
“ serve his own opinion [l].”—Now, for my
part, I cannot conceive, with what view Dr.
Gill mentioned this, or with what pertinency
it is brought in here, unless with a design to in-
sinuate, that *Pelagius*, notwithstanding his
pretences to the contrary, did really deny In-
fant-Baptism. For, the Doctor immediately
adds ; “ And certain it is, according to *Aus-*
“ *tin*, that the *Pelagians* did deny baptism to
“ some Infants, even to the Infants of Believ-
“ ers, &c.” — But, I must leave the Doc-
tor, to reconcile this with what he had
said, under the last article, of *Pelagius* *falling* *in* *with* *the stream of the times*, and *not seeing* *himself concerned about the subjects of baptism* ; and so proceed to examine the truth
of his round assertion, “ that, according to
“ *Austin*, the *Pelagians* did deny baptism to
“ some Infants, even the Infants of Believ-
“ ers.” A strange assertion indeed ! and a
very false one ; as I shall shortly prove, I hope

to the Doctor's conviction. At present, let us consider, what the *complaint* of *Pelagius* really was, and *Austin's* reflections upon it, in order to set the matter in a true light, that the Reader may not be misled by the Doctor's representation of the case. *Pelagius* then said [m] " that he was defamed, and slandered by some men, as *denying the sacrament of baptism to Infants*, and *promising the kingdom of heaven to some without the redemption of Christ*. But (says *Austin*) *these things are not so objected to them, as he hath put them*. For, *neither do they deny the sacrament of baptism to Infants*, *nor promise the kingdom of heaven to any without the redemption of Christ*. Therefore, what he complains of being defamed
" for,

[m] In literis etiam, quas Romam misit (sc. *Pelagius*) ad beatæ memoriae papam Innocentium (quoniam eum in corpore non invenerunt, et sancto papæ Zozimo datae sunt, atque ad nos inde directæ) dicit se ab hominibus infamari, quod negat parvulis baptismi sacramentum, et absque redemptione Christi aliquibus cœlorum regna promittat. Sed non sic illis hæc objiciuntur, ut posuit. Nam neque parvulis negant baptismi sacramentum, neque absque redemptione Christi hæc aliquibus cœlorum regna promittunt. Itaque unde se queritur infamari eo modo *proposuit*, ut facile posset criminis objecto, salvo suo dogmate, respondere. Objicitur autem illis, quod non baptizatos parvulos nolunt damnationi primi hominis obnoxios confiteri, et in eos transiisse originale peccatum regeneratione purgandum, quoniam propter accipendum regnum cœlorum tantummodo eos baptizandos esse contendunt, &c. — Ecce quod eis objicitur de baptismō parvulorum! non quod ipse ita *proposuit*, ut possit suæ propositioni, quasi adversantis *objectioni*, secundum sua dogmata responderet. Denique, quomodo respondeat advertite, et videte latebras, &c. *Aus-*
tin. de Peccat. Orig. cont. Pelag. et Celest. lib. 2.

“ for, he hath stated in such a manner, as
 “ that he might easily answer to what was
 “ objected to him, and preserve his own opi-
 “ nion. (i. e. *as to original sin*) Now, that,
 “ which is objected against them, is *this*,
 “ that they will not acknowledge unbapti-
 “ zed Infants to be liable to the condemna-
 “ tion of the first man, and that *original sin*
 “ hath passed upon them to be purged by re-
 “ generation; because they maintain, *that*
 “ *they are to be baptized only* that they may
 “ receive the kingdom of heaven, &c.—Be-
 “ hold what *is* objected to them concerning
 “ the baptism of Infants! &c.”—Thus,
 whatever shuffling *Pelagius* might use, it was
 not to disguise any private opinion he enter-
 tained against Infant-Baptism, as Dr. *Gill's*
 way of introducing this matter would lead
 one to suspect. For, as *Austin* affirms, this
 was not the thing laid to his charge; on the
 contrary, *Austin* expressly says, that the *Pel-
 agians* did not deny the sacrament of baptism
 to Infants, but held that they were to be bap-
 tized, that they might receive the kingdom
 of heaven.

Let us now examine the truth of our learn-
 ed Doctor's assertion, viz. “ and *certain* it is,
 “ according to *Austin*, that the *Pelagians*
 “ did deny baptism to some Infants, even to
 “ the Infants of Believers, and that for this
 “ reason, because they were holy.” Here,
 upon a little enquiry, it will appear, that the
 Doctor

Doctor was lead into a great mistake, by understanding *absolutely* what was only spoken *hypothetically*. For, the *Pelagians* did not absolutely deny baptism to the Infants of Believers; but they only denied the necessity of it upon the *supposition* of their antagonists, viz. that the design of baptism was *to cleanse from sin*: still insisting upon the necessity of their baptism on another account, viz. *that they might enter into the kingdom of heaven*. It is a disadvantage in this argument, that we have none of their writings entire, and compleat, but are obliged to take up with small scraps, and quotations from them, without the benefit of seeing them in their due order, and connexion. However, by a narrow inspection of the passage upon which Dr. *Gill* hath grounded his mistake, we shall easily detect, and expose his error. St. *Augustin* introduceth the discourse thus [n]: “ But “ what we have said above, in answer to “ those that say, If a sinner begets a sinner, “ a righteous man should beget a righteous “ man; the same we also say in answer “ to those, who affirm, that one born of a “ baptized person should be considered as al- “ ready baptized, &c.” — Now, this argument affects

[n] *Quod autem supra respondimus adversus eos, qui dicunt, si peccator genuit peccatorem, justus quoque justum dignere debuit: hoc etiam his respondemus, qui dicunt de homine baptizato natum, jam veluti baptizatum haberi debuisse, &c. Augustin. de Peccat. merit. et remis. cont. Pelag. lib. 2.*

affects the adult children, as well as the Infants, of baptized christians. But to proceed : a little after we have these words [o] ; “ But “ the apostle says, *your children would be un-* “ *clean, but now are they holy* : and therefore “ *say they, the children of Believers ought* “ *not now to be baptized.*” This is the passage upon which Dr. Gill hath grounded his assertion, that the *Pelagians* denied baptism to the Infants of Believers. But (not to insist, that the words do not mention Infants, but children at large, and so may include the adult children of Believers ; and consequently make as much against adult Baptism, as Infant-Baptism) that the *Pelagians* did not *absolutely* deny baptism to the Infants of Believers, is evident from what follows in answer to their argument ; which is only *argumentum ad hominem*. Says *Austin* [p] “ It is not con- “ trary to our assertion, although holy chil- “ dren are born of Believers, that we say, if “ *they are not baptized, they go into condem-* “ *nation ; to whom (viz. the unbaptized chil-* “ *dren*

[o] *At enim ait apostolus, Filii vestri immundi essent, nunc autem sunt sancti ; et ideo inquiunt fidelium filii jam baptizari minime debuerunt.* *Augustin. ibid.*

[p] *Et contra nostram quidem non est assertionem, etiam si ex fidelibus sancti propagantur, quod eos dicimus, si non baptizantur, pergere in damnationem, quibus et ipsi regnum cœlorum intercludunt, quamvis eos dicant non habere ullum vel proprium, vel originale peccatum.* *Augustin. ibid.* Upon another occasion St. *Augustin* says, that the *Pelagians* never denied, that Infants could not enter into the kingdom of heaven without baptism. *De Peccat. Origin. cont. Pelag. et Celest.* lib. 2.

“ dren of Believers) even they themselves
 “ (viz. the *Pelagians*) shut the kingdom of
 “ heaven, though they say, they have no
 “ sin, personal, or original.”—And now, let
 any impartial Reader judge, whether, as I
 said before, the learned *Doctor* was not lead
 into a great mistake, by understanding *absolutely*, what was only spoken *hypothetically*.
 For, it manifestly appears, from the very
 words of *Austin* in the place referred to by the
Doctor, that the *Pelagians* held Baptism to be
 necessary for the Infants of Believers. There-
 fore, they could not deny Baptism to such In-
 fants *absolutely*, but only upon the supposi-
 tion of their opponents, viz. that the design
 of Baptism was to *cleanse from sin*. And thus,
 the direct contrary of what Dr. *Gill* asserts is
certain according to Austin. We shall take
 him tripping again, under the next article,
 and in a yet more egregious manner.

5. “ *Pelagius* says no such thing, that he
 “ never heard, no not even any impious he-
 “ retic, who denied Baptism to Infants [q].”
 This is a surprizing assertion in the *Doctor*.
 For, we shall presently prove, and out of his
 own mouth, that *Pelagius* said the *very thing*
itself. His words are [r], “ that he never
 “ heard, no not of any impious heretic, who
 “ would say this concerning Infants, which
 he

[q] *Ibid. p. 24.*

[r] Nunquam se vel impium aliquem hæreticum audiisse
 qui hoc, *quod proposuit*, de parvulis diceret.

“ he had *proposed*, or mentioned.” — “ The
“ sense, as the *Doctor* rightly observes, de-
“ pends upon the phrase, *quod proposuit*, *what*
“ *he had proposed*, or *mentioned*, of whom,
“ and *what that is to be understood*.” But
the same or the like phrase is used several
times in the discourse, and plainly refers eve-
ry time to the same person, and thing, viz.
“ to *Pelagius* himself, and to the state of the
“ question, as he had put it [*s*];” to borrow
the *Doctor*’s words again. Accordingly, the
Doctor says, *this seems to be the sense* [*t*].
Well! thus far we are agreed. Nothing now
remains, for clearing up the whole matter,
but to consider, how *Pelagius* had, in fact,
stated the question. “ Representing (says the
“ *Doctor*) that he was charged with promi-
“ sing the kingdom of heaven to some with-
“ out the redemption of Christ [*u*].” But oh,
good *Doctor*! Is this the *whole* of his repres-
entation? (or *proposition*, to use *St. Austin’s* phrase)
Have you not (I am loth to say *designedly*)
dropt the *first part* of it? the part, which ex-
pressly mentions the *Baptism of Infants*? the
very part, in short, upon which the present
question depends! For, *Pelagius* had repre-
sented, and complained [*w*] “ that he was

E "unjust-

[s] Ibid. p. 23. ut posuit—eo modo proposuit—ita proposuit, ut possit suæ propositioni, &c. Vid. supra not. [m].

[t] *Ibid.* [u] *Ibid.*

[w] Dicit se ab hominibus infamari, quod neget parvulis baptis̄mi sacramentum, et absque redēptione Christi hēc ali- quibus cōclorum regna promittat. *Vid. iuxta not. [m].*

“ unjustly charged with *denying the sacrament of baptism to Infants*, and promising “ the kingdom of heaven to some without the “ redemption of Christ ;” as we have seen before. Therefore *this* is, in part, what *Pelagius* said, he never heard, no not of any impious heretic that would say concerning Infants, viz. that they were to be denied Baptism ; which was one thing falsely laid to his charge, as *Pelagius* complained : and the words *refer to the state of the question, as he had put it*, by Dr. *Gill's* own confession. Consequently, the learned *Doctor* is mistaken again, or (which I would hope is not the case) willing to lead others into a mistake, when he affirms, that *Pelagius* says *no such thing*. And to what can we impute the *Doctor's* quoting by halves, and his leaving out the main words of the sentence, upon which the present debate wholly turns ? but to his *excessive* modesty, which could not bear the mortification of a most glaring self-contradiction ? But, upon second thoughts, he may see reason to retract his following words [x], “ take the words “ which way you will, they can't be made “ say, that he never heard, that any heretic “ denied Baptism to Infants.” For, taking the words in *his own way*, they as plainly say *this*, as the other thing he mentions ; because both are equally included in the *proposition*,

or

or in the *state of the question*, as Pelagius had put it. And if the Baptism of Infants was not included in the proposition; how comes their *Baptism*, and *regeneration in Christ*, to be mentioned afterwards with *reference to* it [y]? whether *putat*, or *vetat*, be the right reading. Having set this matter in a proper light; let us now follow the Doctor a step farther.

6. " *Austin* himself doth not say, that
" he had never heard, or read of any catho-
" lic, heretic, or schismatic, that denied In-
" fant-Baptism [z]." — To which I answer,
it is not material to the purpose in hand, whe-
ther *Austin* himself says so, or not. We
have already seen him quote *Pelagius*, saying
the strongest thing, that any man could say,
for the *perpetual* and *universal* practice of In-
fant-Baptism in the christian church from the
beginning. But, the Doctor adds; " He
" could never say any such thing;" and gives
several reasons for it, which we shall examine
in their order.

(1.) Says the Doctor [*a*], “ He must know, “ that Tertullian had *opposed* it.” — Here the Doctor hath changed the *terms* of the proposition. For, he gives it, as a reason to prove,

E 2 that

[y] "Dum eos baptizari, et in Christo renasci putat.—
" So it is in my edition of *Austin*; *putat*, and not *vetat*, as
" Dr. *Wall* quotes it." Dr. *Gill*. *ibid.* p. 23. Vid. *Wall's*
Hist. of Inf. Bap. p. 1. ch. 19. sect. 30.

[z] *Ibid.* p. 24. [a] *Ibid.*

that *Austin* had heard of some body, who denied Infant-Baptism, that he must know, that *Tertullian* had opposed it. But, whatever *Austin* might know of that matter, one thing he certainly knew, viz. how to distinguish between persons denying Infant-Baptism, and their opposing, or contradicting it, in *some* sort [b]. Of this kind was *Tertullian's* opposition to it. For, whatever he said against it, he did not properly deny Infant-Baptism; but, on the contrary, allowed of it in cases of necessity; as will be shewn in its proper place. Therefore the Doctor's first argument falls to the ground. For, St. *Austin* might know, that *Tertullian* had some way opposed it, and yet have never heard of any one that denied Infant-Baptism.

(2.) " And he himself (says the Doctor [c])
 " was at the council of *Carthage*, and there
 " presided, and was at the making of that ca-
 " non, which runs thus; *also it is our plea-*
sure, that whoever denies, that new-born
Infants are to be baptized — let him be
anathema: but to what purpose was this
 " canon made, if he, and his brethren knew
 " of none that denied Infant-Baptism? To
 " say, that this respects some people, who
 " were still of the same opinion with *Fidus*,
 " an *African* Bishop that lived 150 years be-
 " fore

[b] See his words in our Title-page.

[c] *Ibid.*

“ fore this time, that Infants were not to be
 “ baptized until they were eight days old, is an
 “ idle notion of Doctor *Wall* [d] : can any
 “ man in his senses think, that a council,
 “ consisting of all the Bishops in *Africa*,
 “ should agree to *anathemize* their own bre-
 “ thren, who were in the same opinion, and
 “ practice of Infant-Baptism with themselves ;
 “ only they thought it should not be admi-
 “ nistred to them, as soon as born, but at
 “ eight days old? *Credat Iudeus Apella, &c.*”

—Now here let it be observed (1.) It appears by the instance of *Fidus* (whose opinion might possibly survive himself 150 years; there is no *absurdity* in the supposition) that some persons might be against the baptizing of *new-born* Infants; and yet not deny Infant-Baptism, unless they could both deny, and practise it at the same time. For, *Fidus* himself was for having Infants baptized, when they were eight days old; at which age they surely were Infants still. Accordingly (2.) The *Canon* before us relates, not to Infants at large, but only to *new-born* Infants. For, so it is expressed, both in the *Greek* [e], and likewise in the old *Latin* copy, in a Treatise bound up with *St. Austin's works* [f]. Therefore, to ex-
 tend

[d] Hist. of Inf. Bap. part 1. ch. 19. sect. 37.

[e] Τὰ μωρά, καὶ νεογέννητα ἐν τῷ γαστέραν τῷ μητέρων. Canon. 112. Synod. Carthag. Balfamon.

[f] Quicunque parvulos recentes ab uteris matrum bapti-
 zandos negat, &c. *De Ecclesiast. Dogmat.*

tend the canon farther, than to *new-born Infants*, is evidently to pervert it's meaning, and to put a sense upon the canon, which the makers of it never intended. For, if they meant Infants at large; why did they use such a restrictive term, as *new-born Infants*! It must then be a wrong conclusion, for any one to infer from hence, either that *Austin*, or any of his brethren, knew of some, that denied Infant-Baptism. For, if any persons were against the baptizing of *new-born Infants*; it by no means follows, that they denied Infant-Baptism. Because, as appears by the instance of *Fidus*, those, that were in the same opinion and practice of Infant-Baptism with themselves, might nevertheless think, that it should not be administered to them, *as soon as born*. It is observable, that St. *Austin* himself [g] makes mention of *new-born children*, by way of contradistinction from children *eight days old*, with an eye to the scruple of *Fidus*. (3.) It is demonstrably *certain*, that this canon was not made against any persons, that denied Infant-Baptism. Because, it was made against *Pelagius*, and *Celestius*, as is noted by *Photius*, who mentions this canon [h]. But, neither of these men denied Infant-Baptism. What then did they deny? The resolution of this point will lead us into
the

[g] *De peccator. merit. et remis. lib. 3.*

[h] *Bibliothec. Cod. 53.*

the true meaning, and design of the canon ; and so furnish us with a proper answer to the Doctor's question, (viz. " to what purpose was this canon made?") without receding in the least from our hypothesis, that the makers of the canon, even their grand president himself (tho' the council consisted of all the Bishops in *Africa*) knew of none, that denied *Infant-Baptism*.—Now, though *Pelagius* denied, *Celestius* confessed that, according to the usual form of Baptism, Infants were to be baptized *for the remission of sin*; and both agreed in this, that Infants derived no *original sin from Adam*. Let us then consider the canon, which was made against them jointly, with proper attention ; and it will appear to be judiciously, and accurately framed, in few words, according to this double occasion. The canon bears this title [i], " That Infants are, or " are to be, baptized *for the remission of sin*." And it runs thus [k] : " It is also our pleasure, that whosoever *denys* that Infants new- " born are to be baptized, (e. g. *Pelagius*) or " *says* that they should be baptized, (e. g. " *Celestius* [l]) *for the remission of sin*; but " that they derive no *original sin from Adam*, " which

[i] Ὡτὶ Τὰ μικρὰ ἐς ἀφεσιν ἀμαρτίων βαπτίζονται.

[k] Ομοίως ἔπεσεν, ἵνα ὁσιοὶ διηπέλε τὰ μικρὰ, καὶ νεογέννητα ἐκ τῶν γαστέρων τῶν μητέρων βαπτίζομενα αφεῖται, οὐ λέγει εἰς ἀφεσιν σημάρτιων, αὐτὰ βαπτίζεσθαι, μηδὲν δὲ ἐκ τῆς τε Αδάμ, &c.—αὐθερα εἴη.

[l] Vid. *Augustin. cont. Celest. &c. lib. 2. de peccat. orig. cap. 5.*

" which ought to be cleansed by the laver
 " of regeneration, &c. (e. g. both *Pelagius*,
 " and *Celestius*) let him be *anathema*." Thus,
 according to the *title*, and to the *occasion*, and
 to the *construction* of this canon, it is so fram-
 ed, as that the *remission of sin* stands in con-
 nexion with the *first*, as well as with the *se-
 cond* clause; there being a plain contrast be-
 tween *Pelagius's denying*, and *Celestius's con-
 fessing*, the *Baptism of Infants* for the *remis-
 sion of sin*. Therefore, that part of the canon
 was not made against any person, that abso-
 lutely denied the *Baptism* even of *new-born*
 Infants; but against *him*, who denied, that
new-born Infants were to be *baptized* for the
remission of sin; as is well known *Pelagius* did,
 tho' he held their *baptism* to be *necessary* up-
 on another account, viz. *that they might enter*
into the kingdom of heaven. This discovers
 the *reason* of the council's so particularly spe-
 cifying *new-born Infants*. (or, *Infants new-
 born from their mother's womb*; as the canon
 expresses it) Because, as such Infants could
 not be supposed guilty of any *actual*, or *per-
 sonal sin* of their own; this precision in word-
 ing the canon was intended to limit the *rea-
 son* of their *Baptism* to *original sin*. In short,
 the whole *emphasis* lies in *this circumstance*
 of Infants being *new-born*. And no one
 could rationally pretend, as the council itself
 thought [m], that such Infants stood in need

of
 [m] For, upon that supposition they say, (οὐεν γίνεται
 ἀνοι-

of Baptism in it's then *usual* and *common* form, that is to say, *for the remission of sin* [n]; if they derived no *original sin* from *Adam*. And this explains the meaning of what the learned *Photius* says of the council at *Carthage*, who made the canon under consideration, viz. [o] "that they *anathematized* those, who said, " that *new-born Infants* stood in no need of " Baptism, because they derived no original " sin from *Adam*." — Therefore, tho' we have no occasion to suppose with Dr. *Wall*, " that " the canon respects some people, who were " still of the same opinion with *Fidus*, an " *African Bishop*, that lived 150 years before " this time;" (Dr. *Gill* may call this an *idle notion*, if he pleaseth; we want it not) Yet (wonder it, who will) " a council consisting " of all the *Bishops in Africa*, did, in fact, " agree, to anathematize their own brethren, " who were in the same opinion, and practice " of *Infant-Baptism* with themselves;" only they differed about the *reason* of the thing. Nay, we see by an *expres* clause in the canon,

F that

ἀκόλαθον, ὅτι ἐν τοῖς ὁ τύπος τῷ εἰς ἀφεσθν ἀμαρτιῶν βαπτίσ-
μαῖς ἐν ὀλιθίς, ἀλλὰ πλαστὸς νοεῖται) *Ibid.*

[n] Infantes autem debere baptizari in remissionem peccatorum *secundum regulam universalis ecclesie* — confitemur: says *Celestius*. *Augustin.* *de peccat.* *orig. c. 5.* Hence that question, *Quid festinat innocens ætas ad remissionem peccatorum?* *Tertullian.* *de Baptismo.*

[o] Ωταύτως τὸ τὰ βρέφη τὰ ἀρτίτονα μὴ χρέαν ἔχειν βαπ-
τίσματος, διὸ τὸ μὴ ἔλκειν ἀντὸ προγονικὴν ἀμαρτιῶν εἰς Α-
δὰμ, ἀναθερασθῆται. *Synodus Carthag.* *contra Pelagium*, & *Celestium.* *Phot. Biblioth. cod. 53.*

that the members of this council were not satisfied, if a person owned, that Infants were to be baptized *for the remission of sin*; unless he acknowledged that they were to be baptized on the account of *original sin* also. And doth not Dr. Gill himself say, and say truly, (St. *Austin* having testified the same thing [p].)

“ that the controversy with the *Pelagians* was
 “ not about the *subject*, but the *end* of Bap-
 “ tism, and about the latter, and not the for-
 “ mer was the dispute [q].”—This, I presume, any competent, and candid Reader will judge a sufficient answer to what the Doctor hath advanced, both lately, and on a former occasion [r], with reference to the *Carthaginian* council, and their famous *canon*. For, it is manifest upon the whole, “ that tho’ St. *Au-
 “ stin* presided in that council, and was at
 “ the making of this canon; he might not-
 “ withstand, have never heard, or read of
 “ any catholic, heretic, or schismatic, that *de-
 “ nied* Infant-Baptism.”—Let us now consider, what farther props, the Doctor hath, to support his tottering hypothesis.

(3.) [s] “ *Austin* himself makes mention of
 “ some, that argued against it after this man-
 “ ner.

[p] *Concedunt parvulos baptizari oportere. Non ergo quæstio est inter nos, et ipsos, utrum parvuli baptizandi sint, sed de causâ quaeritur, quare baptizandi sint. Augustin. de verb. apst. serm. 14.*

[q] *Ibid. p. 20.*

[r] *Divine right of Inf. Bapt. examined, &c. p. 35.*

[s] *Remarks on Infant-Bapt. a reasonable serv. p. 25.*

“ ner [t].” “ Men are used to ask this question, says he, of what profit is the sacrament of christian-baptism to Infants, seeing when they have received it, for the most part they die, before they know any thing of it.” — But neither doth this come up to the point, or prove, what it is alledged for, viz. that *Austin* had heard of any one (I mean any christian, *whether catholic, heretic, or schismatic*) who denied Infant-Baptism. For (1.) men might ask such a question for their own information, without *denying* Infant-Baptism, or so much as *arguing against* it. In the same place St. *Austin* makes mention of another question, which some *ignorant* people were used to ask, in reference to the *death* of Infants, and their bodily pains. “ What occasion was there for one to be born, who departed this life, before he could merit any thing?” This question he hath no sooner answered, but he mentions the other question produced by the Doctor, and mentions it in such a manner, as to put it upon the same foot with the former [u]. Now, if that question was asked by any christian, it could only be for the sake of information. (and when persons are *ignorant*, it is very commendable in them to desire, to be informed.) For, it is very absurd to suppose,

F 2

pose,

[t] *Augustin. de libero arbit. lib. 3. cap. 23.*[u] *Quo loco etiam illud perscrutari, homines solent, sacramentum baptismi Christi quid parvulis profit, &c.*

pose, that any christian would ask the question, with a design to *argue against* the birth of children, dying in Infancy. But, there is the same reason to suppose *this*, as the Doctor hath to suppose, from the like question concerning the *Baptism* of children, dying in infancy, that the persons, who asked the question, *argued against* it. (2.) If they did thus argue against Infant-Baptism; it is incumbent upon the Doctor to prove, that they were *christians*. For, there is some reason to doubt of it, considering in what manner St. *Austin* introduces the *similar* question going before, calling it a *calumny* [w]: And truly, if it was meant as an *objection*, it is such calumny, or reflection upon divine Providence, as could proceed from the mouth of none, but men of atheistical principles. (3.) They might even *argue* in this manner against Infant-Baptism; and yet not *deny* it: nay, be so far from denying it, as to practise it themselves, supposing them to be *christians*. For, there is such a thing, as *arguing for arguing's sake*: and this very way I have known the same question asked among, and by those, who do practise Infant-Baptism. And I would gravely ask the Doctor, whether he really thinks, that any of those men, who raised the *other* difficulty about the birth of Infants, would scruple, upon the strength of

[w] *Huic autem disputationi objici ab imperitis solet quædam calumnia de mortuis parvolorum, &c. Augustin. ibid.*

of their own objection, to render due benevolence? The application is easy, and I haste to the next thing.

(4.) " And as before observed (says Dr. Gill [x]) he brings in the *Pelagians* saying, " that the Infants of believers ought not to " be baptized [y]." But, in relation to what he hath before observed as to this matter; we have before proved that our learned Doctor is under a gross mistake. And so we proceed to his last argument, (which will prove faulty, like the rest) to prove, " that *Austin* could " not say, what he is made to say."

(5.) " And so *Jerome* [z], who was a co-temporary of his, speaks of some christians, " *qui dare noluerint baptismum, who refused to give baptism to their children*; so that tho' Infant-Baptism greatly obtained in those times, " yet was not so general as this author represents it. *Austin* therefore could not " say, what he is made to say." Thus far the Doctor [a]. But, as his *conclusion* is now come to it's last legs; so it will be hard set, to maintain it's ground. The small scrap of *Latin* words, cited from *Jerome*, may seem, perhaps, to make for his purpose, detached, as they are, from the rest of the sentence; but, considered in their due connexion, they will appear with a different aspect. For, upon examining the passage, the Doctor will be found,

[x] *Ibid.*

[y] *Augustin. de peccator. merit. l. 2. c. 25.*

[z] *Ep. ad Lætam.* [a] *Ibid.*

found, to have repeated his former mistake, by understanding here again *absolutely*, what was only spoken by way of *supposition*. Because, St. Jerome is not *relating a fact*; as the Doctor's manner of quoting him would insinuate; but only *putting a case*; in order to illustrate, and enforce a point, which he had to manage with *Læta*, about sending her daughter *Paula* to *Bethlehem*, &c. And having urged that parents are accountable for their children, during their *minority*, he adds [b]; “unless, perhaps, you suppose, the “children of christians, if they should not “have received *Baptism*, themselves only to “be guilty of sin, and the fault not to lie “also upon those, that would not give them “*Baptism*.” Thus, it is plain, St. Jerome doth not say, what Dr. Gill would make him say; nor is he stating a *matter of fact*, but only arguing upon a *supposition*; and in this manner either he, or any other man, might have argued, if he had never heard of one single christian, that *denied Infant-Baptism*. Besides, if we should suppose, without any necessity, the *case*, which St. Jerome puts, to be *fact*; this will not prove, that any christians *denied Infant-Baptism* in those days, but only that they *neglected* it in some instances.

[b] *Nisi forte existimas, Christianorum filios, si baptisma non receperint, ipsos tantum reos esse peccati, et non etiam scelus referri ad eos, qui dare noluerint, &c. Hieronym. Epist. ad Lætam.*

ces [c]. For, it sometimes happens in our days, that children miss of Baptism, and die without it, through the *neglect* of parents, who are far from denying Infant-Baptism nevertheless. By the way, it is obvious to remark, that the great St. *Jerome* thought, that christian parents could not neglect to get their children baptized, without being guilty of a culpable omission.

We have now gone through all the Doctor's proofs, to support his assertion, " that *Austin could not* say, what he is made to say :" and whether he hath not failed in every one of them, I appeal to all the learned world. Therefore, I will venture to affirm, that for any thing he hath *said* himself to prove the contrary, *Austin could* say, what he is made say ; whether, in fact, he did say it, or not ; which is not very material. It is sufficient for our purpose, that St. *Austin could* say, if he had any occasion, " that he had never heard, or read of any catholic, heretic, or schismatic, that denied Infant-Baptism." And I am amazed to think, that, in attempting to prove the contrary, Dr. *Gill* could satisfy himself, or expect to convince others, with such slight, and superficial arguments. This to me appears very wonderful in a person of his approved learning, and unsuspected integrity

[c] See *Wall's Hist. of Inf. Bap.* P. 2. ch. 3, on *Greg. Nazian.*

integrity ; nor can I otherways account for it, than from the power of prejudices or hurry of precipitation.

What the Doctor next adds, is of little force, speaking still of *Austin* [d]. “ But “ what then doth he say, that he never re-“ membered to have read, in any catholic, “ heretic, or schismatic writer? why, that “ Infants were not to be baptized, that they “ might receive the remission of sins, but that “ they might be sanctified in Christ, &c.” I think the Doctor is here in the right; and also in what follows [e], “ in the same sense “ are we to understand him, when he says, “ and this the church has *always* had, has “ *always* held [f].” “ What? why, that “ Infants are diseased thro’ *Adam*; and stand “ in need of a physician; and are brought to “ the church to be healed. It was the doc-“ trine of original sin, and the Baptism of “ Infants for the remission of it, he speaks “ of in these passages.”—I say, in my opini-“ on, Dr. *Gill* hath here given a true repre-“ sentation of *Austin’s* sense. But then, I must de-“ sire the favour of him, to resolve me one “ question, (whether Infants were to be bapti-“ zed for the *remission of sin*, or for their *sanc-“ tification*) viz. How could any christian, ca-“ tholic, heretic, or schismatic, believe, that the

[d] *Ibid.* [e] *Ibid.* p. 26.

[f] *De verb. apost. serm.* 10.

the Baptism of Infants was of any use, or efficacy for either purpose, without supposing, at the same time, that Infant-Baptism was of *divine authority*, or an apostolical institution, and consequently that it had been *always* practised in the christian church? Accordingly, thus much seems to be implied in St. *Austin's* saying, "This the church has *always* had, has " *always* held." And though, as the Doctor observes [g], "it is one thing what *Austin* says, and another, what *may be thought* " to be the consequence of his so saying;" yet, where is the difference between what *Austin* says, and what *is* a natural consequence of his saying it? such a consequence as *Austin* himself would own, and acknowledge [h]. And, "it is true indeed, says the Doctor [i], " he took Infant-Baptism to be an antient, " and constant use of the church, and an " apostolic tradition." But then the Doctor's way of accounting for this notion of *Austin* is very extraordinary, and such only as might be expected from a writer, that is at a loss what to say. For, thus he proceeds; " which *perhaps* he had taken up from the " Latin translations of *Origen* by *Jerome* and " *Ruffinus*, &c."—But, I must tell the learn-

G ed

[g] *Ibid.*

[h] *Confuetudo tamen matris Ecclesiæ in baptizandis parvulis nequaquam spernenda est, neque ullo modo superflua deputanda, nec omnino credenda, nisi apostolica esset traditio.*
Augustin. de Genes. ad lit. lib. 10.

[i] *Ibid.*

ed *Doctor*, a *perhaps* will not do in this case. As to the business of the *Latin* translations of *Origen* by *Jerome* and *Ruffinus*; we shall settle that account with the Doctor in due time. At present, since *Jerome*, and *Ruffinus* were his cotemporaries, it is natural to ask, how they came by the notion, that Infant-Baptism was an *apostolic tradition*, or *institution*? (words of the same import in the ecclesiastic stile) And, why might not *Austin* come by the notion the same way, that they did, without being beholden to them for it? But, if St. *Austin* took the notion from any particular writer of the church; he had a much earlier author (an *original* too) than these *Latin* translators of *Origen*. For, he says himself [k], “Blessed *Cyprian* indeed, not “making any *new* decree, but preserving the “established faith of the church, to rectify “the mistake of those, who thought, that “a child was not to be baptized before the “eighth day from the birth, said not that “the flesh, but the soul was [not] to be lost; “and

[k] *Beatus quidem Cyprianus non aliquod decretum condens novum sed Ecclesiæ fidem firmissimam servans ad corrigendum eos, qui putabant ante octavum diem nativitatis non esse parvulum baptizandum, non carnem, sed animam [non] dixit esse perdendam, et mox natum ritè baptizari posse, cum suis quibusdam co-episcopis censuit. Sed contra Cypriani aliquam opinionem, ubi quod videndum fuit fortasse non vidit, sentiat quæque quod libet: tantum contra apostolicam manifestissimam fidem nemo sentiat, qui ex unius delicto omnes in condemnationem duci prædicat, ex qua condemnatione non liberat, nisi gratia Dei per Jesum, &c. Augustin. Hieronymo Ep. 28.*

" and judged with his fellow-bishops, that a
 " *new-born* child might be rightly baptized.
 " But against any opinion of *Cyprian*, where
 " he did not see, perhaps, what should be
 " seen, let any one think, what he pleaseth ;
 " only let no man think against the manifest
 " *faith of an Apostle*, who declares, that by
 " the offence of one, all were brought into con-
 " demnation, &c." It is thus, that St. *Austin*
 writes, in an epistle to *Jerome* himself. Is it
 likely then, that he learned his notion of In-
 fant-Baptism, as an apostolical tradition from
 St. *Jerome*, or *Ruffinus*? And was not St.
Cyprian, whom he quotes, a much earlier
 writer than either of them ? And yet, we see,
 he did not consider the Baptism of Infants,
 particularly for original sin, as a *novel thing*
 in *Cyprian's* time, nor did he found it merely
 upon *Cyprian's* authority, but referred it to a
 much higher original, even the authority of
 an *apostle*. Again: St. *Austin* says [*l*] " that
 " antiently, the *universal church* held, that
 " Infants of Believers obtained the remis-
 " sion of original sin by the Baptism of Christ.
 " Whence not without reason blessed *Cyprian*

G 2

" suf-

[*l*] Ut antiquitus universa ecclesia pertineret fideles parvulos
 originalis peccati remissionem per Christi baptismum consecu-
 tos. Unde non immerito beatus *Cyprianus* tatis ostendit quam
 hoc ab initio creditum, et intellectum iervet Ecclesia, qui
 cum parvulos a materno utero recentissimos jam idoneos ad per-
 cipiendum baptismum afferet; quoniam consultus fuerat utrum
 hoc ante octavum diem fieri deberet. *Idem. de peccat. merit.*
 lib. 3.

“ sufficiently shews, how the church pre-
 “ serves this, as it was believed, and un-
 “ derstood from the begining; who, when
 “ children are *new-born*, asserted that they
 “ are fit for the Baptism of Christ; because,
 “ his opinion had been asked, whether this
 “ ought to be done before the eighth day.”

Once more; speaking of the same thing, and referring to the same epistle, viz. that to *Fidus*, he says again [m]: “ *Holy Cyprian*, what
 “ he thought of the Baptism of Infants, yea,
 “ what he hath showed the church *always*
 “ *thought*, hear in a few words, &c.” — And now, what becomes of the Doctor’s *perhaps*? Or, what force, what truth can there be, in his reason to support it, when he adds, “ since
 “ no other ecclesiastical writer speaks of it
 “ as such in those days.” For, St. *Austin*, we see, without appealing to *Origen* at all, translated, or untranslated, hath found another ecclesiastical writer in the same age, speaking the same language, and assigning the same *ground* of Infant-Baptism, that *Origen* is made to do.

But the Doctor grows more positive: for, still speaking of “ *Austin’s* taking Infant-Baptism to be an antient, and constant usage
 “ of the church, and an apostolic traditon.”

Dr.

[m] *Sanctus Cyprianus* — quid senserit de baptismo parvulorum, immo quid semper Ecclesiam sensisse, monstraverit, paululum accipite. *Idem. de verb. apost. serm. 15.* *Confer Cyprian Ep. ad Fidum.*

Dr. Gill says [n], without a *perhaps*, “ but in this he was deceived, and mistaken, as he was in other things, which he took for apostolic traditions; which ought to be equally received as this, by those, who are influenced by his authority.” — Now, this is plainly *begging the question*; a great sign of an *impoverished* cause. It is roundly asserting the very thing, which is to be proved, and which, I am sure, never can be proved by such an argument, as the Doctor hath here advanced. For, in the name of *Logic*, where is the consequence? that, because St. *Austin* was *deceived*, and *mistaken* in *other* things (supposing him to be so) therefore he was deceived and mistaken in *this*, “ that Infant-Baptism was an antient and constant usage of the church, and an apostolic tradition? ” Is not this arguing without a *genus*, from one *particular* to another, contrary to the rules of the Logicians? The Doctor himself is deceived, if he imagines, that we are *influenced* solely by *Austin’s authority* in this question. And, perhaps, upon second thoughts, he will permit us to join with *Austin* at least *Jerome* and *Ruffinus*; and to cast the weight of their authority into the same scale; when he remembers, what he hath said of their *Latin* translations of *Origen*. However, if *Austin* was mistaken in *some* points;

points ; this proves indeed that he was not *infallible* ; but it doth not prove, that he was *always* in an error, nor, consequently was his being deceived in other matters any proof, that he was mistaken in his notion of Infant-Baptism, as an apostolical institution. I hope, Dr. *Gill* is sometimes in the right, though, I have shewn, I think, that he is often in the wrong. But, what a strange *principle* doth he reason upon here ! viz. that we must believe a *fallible* man in *nothing*, unless we will believe him in *every thing* ! Nay, that an *honest man* is obliged to it ! What ! is it come then to *this* ? that all men must be *knaves*, for using a judgment of discretion ; or *fools*, and believe every thing at random ! But surely, *est modus in rebus* : there is a *medium*, proper to be observed, between being *wholly* influenced by any man's authority, and paying *no regard* to it at all.

But the Doctor insists [o], “ Every *honest man*, that receives Infant-Baptism upon the “ foot of tradition, ought to receive every “ thing else upon the same foot, of which “ there is equally as *full*, and as *early* evi- “ dence of *apostolic tradition*, as of this.” — All which we readily grant. But, when he says afterwards [p], of *several other rites, and usages*, by him specified, not only “ that they “ claim their rise from *apostolic tradition*, but “ have

" have equal evidence of it, as Infant-Baptism has;" this we utterly deny, and shall now try the strength of his hypothesis, not doubting but, whatever equality of evidence may appear in *some* respects, we shall discover a plain inequality of evidence in *others*; as the *Doctor* hath stated the case. For,

(1.) In respect to *Infant-communion*, with which the *Doctor* begins his detail [q], the evidence, which he hath produced, of it's being an *apostolic tradition* is not *equally* as full, and as early, as of *Infant-Baptism*. In the words alledged by the *Doctor* from St. *Austin* [r], he is indeed *arguing in his manner* for *Infant-communion*, and urging it from the regard which all christians owed to the *authority* of Christ, and his apostles, as the proper ground, and standard of the *catholic faith*. But, when St. *Austin* only *argues* for *Infant-communion*, or delivers his *own opinion* about it, tho' in the strongest terms; every one must see, that this is a very different thing, from his *testifying*, and declaring what was the *antient*, and *universal* practice of the *christian church*; as he doth in the case of *Infant-Baptism*. But, the *Doctor* affirms [s], " that of the necessity
" of

[q] *Ibid.* p. 27.

[r] " If they pay any regard to the *apostolic authority*, or
" rather to the Lord and Master of the apostles, &c. — No
" man that remembers that he is a *christian*, and of the *ca-*
" *tholic faith* denies, or doubts that *Infants*, &c." *Augustin.*
Ep. 106.

[s] *Ibid.*

“ of this, as well as of Baptism to eternal life,
 “ *Austin* says [*t*], the *African* christians took
 “ to be an *antient apostolic tradition.*” Now,
 here I might borrow the Doctor’s words, and
 say point blank, “ *Austin* says no such thing.
 “ What then does he say? Why, that the
 “ christians of *Carthage* very well call Bap-
 “ tism itself nothing else but *health*; and the sa-
 “ crament of the body of Christ, nothing else
 “ but *life*. From whence? but, *as I suppose*,
 “ from an *antient and apostolic tradition.*”

— Thus, what *Austin* delivers only as his own *private* opinion, Dr. *Gill* represents him, as declaring it to be the general opinion, not only of the christians of *Carthage*, but of the *African* christians at large. Is this quite fair dealing? But, how differently St. *Austin* expresseth himself, when speaking of Infant-Baptism as an apostolic tradition, is extremely evident from what hath been said before. To which let me add the following passage in the same book, to which the Doctor hath here referred us [*u*]. “ Moreover, because they grant, that
 “ Infants are to be baptized, who cannot go
 “ against

[*t*] Optime Punici christiani baptismum ipsum nihil aliud quam *salutem*, et sacramentum corporis Christi nihil aliud quam *vitam*, vocant. Unde? nisi ex antiqua, *ut existitur*, et apostolica traditione. *Augustin. de peccator. merit.* & *remis. lib. 1. c. 24.*

[*u*] Porro quia parvulos baptizandos esse concedunt, qui contra authoritatem universae Ecclesiae proculdubio per Dominum et apostolos traditam, venire non possunt, &c. *Augustin. ibid. cap. 26.*

“ against the authority of the *universal church*,
 “ without all doubt, delivered by the Lord
 “ and his apostles, &c.” Thus then, of *Infant-Baptism*, as the *antient* and *universal* practice of the church, and an *apostolic* tradition *St. Austin* speaks with the utmost confidence; but not so doth he express himself concerning *Infant-communion* under the same notion. Therefore, upon the foot of his testimony, *Infant-communion* hath not an *equal claim* to *apostolic tradition*, or the *same evidence* of it, as *Infant-Baptism* hath:

The Doctor adds [w] “ *Innocent* the first, his “ cotemporary, was also of the same mind.” What mind? Was it that *Infant-communion* was an *apostolic tradition*? Granting this; doth it therefore follow, that it hath the same evidence on it’s side, that *Infant-Baptism* hath? Or, doth *Innocent* the first, or *Cyprian*, whom the Doctor mentions afterwards, ever testify of *Infant-communion*, what *St. Austin* declares of *Infant-Baptism*, viz. that it was *the antient, constant, and universal practice of the church*? and consequently an *apostolical institution*? The Doctor vainly swaggers, when, speaking of the case of a child mentioned by *Cyprian*, he says [x], “ Now here is a plain “ instance of *Infant-communion* in the *third century*; and we *defy* any one to give a

H “ more

[w] *Ibid.* p. 23.

[x] *Ibid.* p. 29. *Confer Cyprian. de latis.*

“ more early instance, or an instance so early, “ of Infant-Baptism.” — This is a mere bra-
vado ; bullying, not arguing. For, if by an *instance* he means a particular fact, so circum-
stantially related, as *that other* ; what can he
infer from it? Is it, that Infant-Baptism was
not practised, *before* that case happened? No:
this he doth not pretend : for the Doctor him-
self supposes, “ that this very child was bap-
“ tized, or otherwise, says he, it would not
“ have been admitted to the Lord’s Supper.”
Very well! then by the Doctor’s confession,
Infant-Baptism was practised *before* Infant-
communion : none being admitted to the
Lord’s Supper before they were baptized [y].
However, he adds, “ it is reasonable to sup-
“ pose, they both began together.” But he
produceth no proof, or evidence of it.—There-
fore, if the Doctor’s *challenge* hath any mean-
ing at all, it must be *this* ; that there is no
sufficient evidence that Infant-Baptism was
practised before *that* time. And, if this is
what he intended to suggest, I accept his chal-
lenge, and hope shortly to give him satis-
faction.

(2.) If those other rites, and usages, men-
tioned by St. *Basil* [z], to whom the Doctor next
refers us [a], are called *apostolical traditions*, in
common

[y] *Vid. Justin Martyr. Apol. 2.*

[z] *De Spiritu Sanct. C. 27.*

[a] *Ibid. p. 29.—35.* As for the custom of giving a
mixture

common with Infant-Baptism ; yet there is this remarkable *difference* between it and them, that St. *Basil* speaks of them, as *unwritten traditions*, but he doth not mention Infant-Baptism under that notion, or as one of that number. This, I say, makes a *remarkable difference* in the case. For, we see, that Infant-Baptism was none of those rites, which the primitive church built upon a *mystical sense* of *scripture*, or which in St. *Basil's* time were only *presumed* to be apostolical institutions, on account of their having early and generally obtained [b] ; otherwise, they had ranked it also among the *unwritten traditions*. Therefore they considered Infant-Baptism, as having *stronger evidence* on it's side, than any of those *unwritten traditions* ; and consequently, it's apostolic authority is *better supported*, than that of those *other rites*, and usages, even upon the foot of *their testimony*.—If any one should object, that by this argument, *Infant-communion*, spoken of before, would be put upon the same foot with Infant-Baptism ; I freely

H 2

grant

mixture of milk and honey to a person just baptized, mentioned by Dr. *Gill*, p. 36. it stands upon the same ground with the rest. And let me observe, the *higher* it can be traced ; so much the *earlier* proof there is, that Baptism was considered under the notion of *regeneration*. Because *milk* and *honey* was the food of Infants. And so, the giving this mixture to a person just baptized, denoted his being *new-born* : ad *Infantiæ significationem*, says St. *Jerome*. advers. *Luciferian*. C. 4.

[b] See *Divine Oracles*, in answer to two *Catechisms*.
sect. 3.

grant it, and therefore acknowledge that there is more to be said for it, than for any of the *unwritten traditions*, as they are called [c]. But then, what hath been already said, under the preceding article, and what will be farther observed hereafter, when we come to St. Cyprian, plainly shews a visible *disparity* between it, and Infant-Baptism.

(3.) Infant-Baptism, as I can assure the Doctor, appears to many persons, who pass for men of sense and *probity* among their neighbours, a more *rational* thing, upon the whole, than any of the *unwritten traditions*, mentioned by him, and therefore *more likely* to be an apostolical institution. So that, in the judgment of discretion they verily think, that a *superior* regard is due to the *testimony* of the primitive church on it's behalf. For, the *matter* of Infant-Baptism, whatever may be said of the *subject*, is a divine ordinance, as may be proved from *scripture*; but none of the *unwritten traditions*, tho', perhaps, originally founded upon *scripture*, by one *sort* of construction or another, can be proved from it. Now, doth not this material circumstance make a very wide *difference*? Doth it not appear in this view more *probable* that Baptism, which can be proved to be a divine ordinance, should be applied to Infants by an apostolic tradition, than that any of those things should be apostolic traditions,

[c] See Mr. James Pierce's treatise upon that subject.

ditions, which can in no shape be proved to be divine institutions? In the one case, only the *subject* is the matter in question; in the other, the *very things* themselves. If any one should here renew the former objection about *Infant-communion*; I refer him to my former answer.

(4.) It doth not appear, that the unwritten traditions were ever put to the same *test* of their apostolical authority, as *Infant-Baptism* was, as we hinted before, and stood the trial, as it did, particularly in the *Pelagian* controversy. And thus, we are come round to the *Pelagians* again, where we began.

Upon the whole then, I imagine, that an *honest man* may be an honest man still, and yet think in his conscience, that the testimony of the primitive church deserves more regard in favour of *Infant-Baptism* as an apostolical institution, than in behalf of the unwritten traditions under that notion. The attentive, and judicious Reader must have observed in the process of this argument, that Dr. *Gill* hath expressly given us up by name some of the greatest lights of the church in the *fourth* century, as vouchers for the apostolic authority, and *antiquity* of *Infant-Baptism*: viz. *St. Jerome*, *Ruffinus*, and *Augustin*. And he hath in effect, given us all the rest. For, he hath not been able to produce one single author in this period on the other side of the question. If any one should suppose, that

that *Gregory Nazianzen* was an Antipædo-baptist, because he advised the delay of childrens Baptism till they were three years old ; he would be much mistaken : for he approved of their Baptism at any age in case of danger [d].

S E C T I O N III.

A View of Infant-Baptism in the third Century.

HAVING seen how the case stood in the *fourth*, and in the begining of the *fifth* century ; let us now carry our enquiries back into the *third*, and so upwards, 'till we come to the *times of the apostles*, and to the *Holy Scriptures* themselves, from whence the *right* of Infant-Baptism (which we reserve, at present for the subject of another dissertation) must be derived. (Though as to the *fact*, the matter now in hand, I might leave it to rest upon the evidence already produced, 'till better evidence can be offered on the contrary side, without giving ourselves any farther trouble

[d] Τί δέ ἀν ἔποις περὶ τῶν ἔτι νηπίων—ἢ γε ταῦτα βαπτίσομεν; πάντα γε, ἐπειδὴ τις ἐπέστη καὶ δύναται. *Greg. Nazian. de baptism. Orat. 140.*

ble about it.) In this century we find a question, relating to the Baptism of Infants, unanimously resolved by a synod of sixty-six Bishops, with the famous St. *Cyprian* at the head of them, who flourished about the *middle* of it. But, what was this question? Why, not absolutely concerning Infant-Baptism itself; or, whether Infants were to be baptized at all, (for this point was no matter of doubt, or dispute among them) but, whether *new-born* Infants were to be baptized, particularly whether it was lawful to baptize a child before the eighth day, according to the time of circumcision among the *Jews*. This was what one *Fidus* scrupled; but *Cyprian* [e] tells him, “ We are all, here assembled in coun-
 cil, of another mind; and no one of us
 came into your sentiments; but, on the
 contrary, we all concluded, that the grace,
 and mercies of God were to be denied to
 none, who should come into the world.”
 Upon which Mr. *Marshall* makes this pertinent and just remark, in his *notes* upon the place: “ The unanimity, wherewith, this
 question was carried, shews that Infant-
 Baptism was at *this time* no *novel usage*;
 there was no manner of dispute whether
 Infants should be baptized; but whether
 before the eighth day, or not: To which
 the unanimous resolution was, that the
 “ grace

“ grace of God should be denied to none.” —And now, what have the *Antipædo-baptists* to say to this? Why, a desperate case requires a desperate cure. Having therefore no other way left, to deal with the argument, from *Cyprian*, for the indisputed practice of Infant-Baptism in his time; they, at least some of them [f], will needs question the *genuineness* of his epistle to *Fidus*; without any sort of proof, or pretence, fit to be opposed to the testimony of *Austin*, who, as we have seen before, refers to that epistle, as *Cyprian's*, over, and over again. Nor, have we only his authority for the genuineness of the epistle itself, but also his testimony for the proper *sense* and meaning of it, so far as relates to the matter in hand, with this farther declaration concerning it, that the *resolution*, therein mentioned, was not any *new decree*, introducing a *novel* custom, but agreeable to the constant opinion, and practice of the christian church from the begining; as manifestly appears by his words, already cited in the preceding section. Now, if it was an *antient* custom in *St. Cyprian's* time to baptize children, particularly before the eighth day, Infant-Baptism could not then be a *new* thing, or a *late* invention.

What becomes now of Dr. *Gill's* open *challenge* aforesaid? Doth it not already begin, to look

[f] *D'anvers: Treatise of baptism. Blackwood: Storming of Antichrist.*

look a little out of countenance? But says the Doctor [g] " by *Fidus*, the country Bishop, applying to the council, to have a doubt resolved, whether it was lawful to baptize Infants until they were eight days old; it appears to be a *novel* practice, and that as yet it was undetermined by council, or custom, *when* they were to be baptized, whether as soon as born, or on the eighth day, &c." — Now, granting all this, what doth it signify, in reference to Infant-Baptism at large? For, the doubt of *Fidus* had no relation to Infant-Baptism, *as such*; but only to the particular time of administering it, as the Doctor himself hath stated the case. Therefore, to invert his argument, since *Fidus*, the country Bishop, did *not* apply to the council, to have any doubt resolved, whether it was lawful to baptize Infants *at all*; by this Infant-Baptism appears not to be a *novel* practice. Besides, the particular day, or time, when Infants *should* be baptized, is a circumstance not yet positively determined, but *left to every one's liberty*. Doth it therefore follow, that Infant-Baptism in *these days* is a *novel practice*? Persons now differ about the particular time of administering the *Lord's Supper* [h]. And doth it from hence follow, that the celebration of this holy ordinance is a *novel practice*?

I in

[g] Argum. from apost. tradit. &c. p. 18.

[b] See Dr. Gill's answer to a Welch Clergyman. *ibid.* p. 108.

in the present age ? Or, would this be a just inference, 1500 years hence, from the different customs, or scruples, which now obtain amongst christians, in relation to that matter ?—But, the Doctor adds ; “ it should also be observed, that in this age Infant-communion was practised, as well as Infant-Baptism ; and very likely both began together, as it is but reasonable, that if the one be admitted, the other should.”—To which I answer ; as to the *reasonableness* of the thing ; this is not the subject of our *present* enquiry ; but only the *fact*. And, though Dr. Gill is pleased to say, *very likely both began together* ; yet he offers no proof of it. This matter hath been considered before. And to what hath been already said upon it, I shall here add the words of Mr. Marshall [i]. “ Infants were admitted, ‘tis plain, in our author’s time and country, to receive the holy Eucharist ; which indeed was a just consequence of interpreting John vi. 53. (except *ye eat the flesh of the Son of man, and drink his blood, ye have no life in you*) of the holy Eucharist ; since, upon the foot of that principle, children could with no more safety be deprived of the holy Eucharist, than of Baptism. And, as to the preparations necessary, the same objections might seem to lie against Infant-Baptism, as against Infant-

“ Infant-communion. But, tho’ this practice obtained in our author’s time, *Tertullian’s* silence in it, where he had a just occasion of mentioning it (upon his advising against Infant-Baptism) gives some reason of suspecting, that it was not much earlier than our author, nor therefore very general, &c.”

Proceed we now to *Origen*, who flourished about the year A. D. 230. He mentions Infant-Baptism on sundry occasions [k], but never otherwise than as a thing in *common use*, and practice. And, not only so; but he speaks of it as a *tradition*, or (which is the same thing in the sacred, and ecclesiastical stile [l], tho' Dr. *Gill* [m] says, " If Infant-Baptism is " a tradition of the apostles, then — it is " not a scriptural busines") an *institution*, which the church received from the apostles; and, consequently, as what had been always

[k] *Quia nemo mundus a forde, nec si unius diei sit vita ejus. Addi his etiam illud potest, ut requiratur, quid causæ fit, cum baptisma Ecclesiæ in remissionem peccatorum detur, secundum Ecclesiæ observantiam etiam parvulis baptismum dari, &c. Origen in Levit. Hom. 8. — Et quia per baptisimi sacramentum nativitatis fordes deponuntur, propterea baptizantur et parvuli. Nisi enim quis renatus fuerit ex aquâ, &c. Idem in Levit. Hom. 14. Pro hoc et Ecclesiæ ab apostolis traditionem suscepit etiam parvulis baptismum dare. Sciebant enim illi, quibus mysteriorum secreta commissa sunt divinorum, quia essent in omnibus genuinæ fordes peccati, quæ per aquam, et spiritum ablui deberent. Idem. Comment. in Ep. ad Roman. lib. 5.*

[1] See this point lately discussed. *Divine Oracle*.

[m] Page 40.

practised from the begining. Thus, we have the clear testimony of the great *Origen*, not only for the practice of Infant-Baptism in *his own days*, but for the *constant* use of it all along from the time of the apostles. But weak, and tender eyes cannot bear a strong light. No wonder then, if all methods are tried, to evade the force of such bright and glaring evidence.

Says Dr. *Gill* [n]; “ It should be observed “ that these quotations are not from the *Greek* “ of *Origen*.”—True; they are only *Latin* translations from the *Greek*; but are they *false* translations? This the Doctor doth not venture to affirm. But, he tries another way to get clear of the argument, drawn from these passages. For, speaking of *Origen* he says [o]; “ His *Homilies* on *Leviticus*, and “ exposition of the epistle to the *Romans*, out “ of which *two* of them are taken, are tran- “ slated by *Ruffinus*; who with the *former*, “ he himself owns, he used much freedom, “ and *added* much, and took such a liberty “ in both of adding, *taking away*, and chang- “ ing, that, as *Erasmus* says, whoever reads “ these pieces, it is uncertain whether he “ reads *Origen*, or *Ruffinus*.”—But, notwithstanding *Erasmus*’s censure, if we attend to what *Ruffinus* himself says; it will appear, that there is no such mighty matter in it, as, perhaps,

perhaps, may be imagined. For, as a learned writer of the last age hath observed [p], “ *Ruffinus* acknowledges, in translating *Origen's Homilies on Leviticus*, that he added some things to what *Origen* said, and what they were he expresses, ea quæ ab origine in auditorio Ecclesiæ ex tempore, non tam explanationis, quam ædificationis intensi- one perorata sunt [q], the things, which were spoken by *Origen* to his auditory, he translated them by way of explanation, or did more fully lay them forth in a popular way; and therein *Ruffinus* dealt candidly, telling us what were the things he added; in this *Erasmus* acknowledges his fair dealing. But, as for his commentary on the *Romans*, *Ruffinus* confesseth [r], se hoc opus totum ad dimidium traxisse, there was no addition of *Ruffinus*; *Erasmus* here blames him for cutting off what *Origen* delivered more at large, but neither doth *Ruffinus* confess, nor *Erasmus* challenge him here for, any addition to what *Origen* said.” Thus then, this great out-cry about additions, and interpolations in the *Latin* translations of *Origen* by *Ruffinus*, comes to nothing!

But,

[p] *Mr. Stephen Marshall. Answer to Tombes.* p. 16, 17.

[q] *Ruffini* peroratio in Ep. ad Rom. Confer Wall's answer to Gale, p. 371.

[r] Idem præfat. ad Rom. Confer *Erasmi* Cens. de Homil. in Levit. For, *traxisse*, l. *contraxisse*. Confer Wall. hist. p. 1, ch. 5. sect. 6.

But, let us suppose, that both *Ruffinus* in the *Homilies* on *Leviticus*, and in the *Commentary* on the *Romans* made some additions of his own ; and also that St. *Jerome* did the same in translating the *Homilies* on *Luke*, *out of which is the other passage*, alledged for Infant-Baptism ; I say, supposing all this, What doth it signify in the present case ; unless it could be proved, that the particular passages under consideration are *additions*, or *interpolations* ? Dr. *Gill* makes a feeble attempt this way, saying [s], “ it looks very probable, that these very passages are additions, or interpolations of these men, since the language agrees with those times, and no other ; for, no cotemporary of *Origen*’s, nor any writer before him, or after him, until the times of *Ruffinus*, *Jerome* and *Austin*, speak of Infant-Baptism as an *usage* of the church, or an *apostolical tradition*.”—But, the weakness, and fallacy of this way of reasoning must obviously appear to any one, that considers, how few writers, cotemporary with *Origen*, are now remaining ; and yet neither out of those few, nor out of *any writer before him*, or *after him* in the primitive times, hath Dr. *Gill* been able to produce one single author that speaks a *contrary* language of Infant-Baptism, or plainly denies, what *Origen* is made so clearly to affirm, concerning it. Besides, doth it not

not appear with undeniable evidence, from what hath been already remarked on St. Cyprian's epistle to *Fidus*, that Infant-Baptism was the *common usage* of the church in his time? And doth not the same St. Cyprian in the same epistle, suggest the same *ground* of Infant-Baptism, that *Origen* himself is represented to do in these *Latin* translations? Saying [*t*], " if " remission of sins be granted to these most " heinous offenders, who have long ago sinned " against God ; and if none of them be de- " nied access to the grace of Baptism ; how " much less reason is there for denying it to " Infants ; who, being but *newly-born*, can be " guilty of no sin, except that, by being deriv- " ed from *Adam*, according to the flesh, their " birth hath communicated to them the in- " fection, and punishment of his offence, &c."

— Thus, in effect, *Cyprian* declares Infant-Baptism to be an *apostolical tradition*; for, otherwise, neither he, nor any other sensible man, could suppose it to be of any use or efficacy for the *remission of sin*, or any *signification* of the *grace of God*. Therefore the language of *Origen*, in the *Latin* translations, agrees with the language and sentiments of the *Cyprianic* age, that is to say, *his own*. To all which let me add from Dr. *Wall* [*u*]. " In " the *Greek* remains there are sentences, and " expressions so alike and parallel to those— " and

[*t*] *Cyprian. Ep. ad Fidum.*

[*u*] *Answer to Gale. Appendix. p. 11.*

“ and citations of texts of scripture applied so
 “ much to the same purpose; that they do
 “ confirm these to be genuine translati-
 “ ons, &c.”

Having now, I think, overthrown Dr. Gill's pretended grounds of *probability*; I shall shew, in the next place, it is so far from being probable, that the passages under consideration are *additions*, or *interpolations* in *Origen*, as that there is not only the *highest probability*, but a *moral certainty* of the contrary. Says Mr. Marshall [w] (speaking of the passage in the commentary on the epistle to the *Romans*. *For this reason the church of Christ received it as a tradition from the apostles, to baptize children, &c.*) “ Nor could *Ruffinus*
 “ easily be supposed to palm this passage up-
 “ on *Origen*, with whom he took, indeed,
 “ great liberties, where he had occasion to
 “ defend his favourite author from some im-
 “ imputations; but here, I say, he had no
 “ such occasion: since it was never made any
 “ part of *Origen's* accusations, that he was
 “ *against* Infant-Baptism, and therefore *Ruf-
 finus* could have no temptation thence, to
 “ represent him as a friend to it, if he were
 “ really not so; nor to coin any passages for
 “ him to that purpose.”—Besides, as to the
 other passage, in the *Homilies* on *Leviticus*;
 Dr. Gill himself hath unluckily observed “ that
 “ *Vossius*

“ *Vossius* [x] thinks that the passage cited was
 “ of the greater authority against the *Pela-*
 “ *gians*, because *Rufinus* was inclined to
 “ them.” Is it not then absurd to suppose,
 and ridiculous to suggest, that *Rufinus* would
 coin any such passages for *Origen*, as imported
 that *original sin* was the ground and reason
 of Infant-Baptism, directly contrary to his
 own private opinion? Here *Rufinus* hath ex-
 hibited a remarkable proof of his honesty,
 which must give the greater authority to his
 translations of *Origen*, and at the same time
 confirm the genuiness of the *third* passage in
 his *Homilies on Luke*, as translated by *Jerome*;
 especially considering that these two great
 men, *Rufinus*, and *Jerome* were bitter ene-
 mies to each another, and yet perfectly agreed
 in giving the sense of *Origen*, upon the point
 in question, the same way [y].

And now I appeal to all unprejudiced, and impartial men, whether the testimonies alledged from *Origen* do not stand good, as authentic proofs, not only of the practice of Infant-Bap-
 tism in his time, but as practised under the no-
 tion of an apostolical tradition. But what proof
 so early, or what evidence so strong, can our
 mighty champion (to remind him again of
 his noble *challenge*) produce for Infant-com-
 munion? It is in vain to seek for his proofs

K *good against*
infant baptism

[x] *Hist. Pelag.* P. 1. lib. 2. *Confer Wall. hist. of Inf.*
Bap. P. 1. ch. 5. sect. 8.

[y] See Dr. Wall; *ibid.*

against Infant-Baptism in this period ; for he hath none at all. 'Tis true, speaking of the Greek of *Origen* Dr. *Gill* says [z], " many " things may be observed from thence in " favour of adult-baptism :" an assertion either false, or very impertinent ! It is quite *impertinent*, and nothing to the purpose, if he means not adult-baptism *exclusive* of Infant-Baptism ; for in that sense many things of the same nature may be observed from St. *Austin*, and other writers, who lived in those times, when Infant-Baptism, by the confession of it's adversaries themselves, undoubtedly prevailed [a]. But if the Doctor's meaning be, that many things may be observed, from the Greek of *Origen* in favour of adult-baptism *exclusive* of Infant-Baptism, or in opposition to it, and *against* it ; then, what he says is utterly *false*, and, to play the Hero in my turn, I *challenge* him to make good his assertion.—Therefore, as for Bishop *Taylor*'s [b] observation here cited by Dr. *Gill*, concerning *Origen* (who, by the way, was never accused of

[z] P. 17 EDITION OF 1715.

[a] e. g. When they speak of the qualifications of *new converts* requisite in order to baptism. See *Wall's answer*. p. 399, &c.

[b] *Liberty of prophesying*, p. 320. This is a book often cited by the *Antipædo-baptists*, who affect, upon all occasions to bring in the name of Bishop *Taylor* ; tho' " he declared what he wrote to have been only some objections easily to be answered ; and which afterward he did answer himself." See *Wall's hist. of Inf. Bapt.* p. 2. ch. 2. and *Defense*. p. 433. But it was not for Dr. *Gill's* purpose, to take notice of these things.

of heresy for holding Infant-Baptism) it may be strongly retorted. For, one plain authority on the one side is a *fuller testimony* than no authority at all on the other side.

S E C T I O N IV.

A View of Infant-Baptism in the second Century.

WE have seen how the case stood in the *third century*. And if “out of “the mouth of two, or three witnesses every “word shall be established;” especially when they are not confronted by any *cross* evidence; proper proof, I presume, hath been produced of the *practice* of Infant-Baptism in that period. Let us now rise a step higher, and look back into the *second century*, the age next to that of the apostles. At the end of this century we find *Tertullian*; whose testimony for the *practice* of Infant-Baptism in his time is clear enough; tho’, as to the *right* of the thing, the *Antipædo-baptists* are wont, to alledge his authority on *their* side of the question. It is only the *fact*, that is the matter of our present enquiry. But we shall here take occasion, to consider, *en passent*,

what is commonly alledged from this antient writer against the *right* of Infant-Baptism also. There is one thing I would premise, which perhaps is not duely attended to in this argument, but deserves consideration, as it may throw some light upon the question before us. It is *this*, that, though the stated time of *circumcision* was fixed to a certain day so precisely, that it was neither to be administred before that day, nor *after* it ; yet the time of *Baptism* was not so limited to any particular age. From hence the primitive christians might easily conclude, that *Baptism* was *lawful* at any age ; and yet differ in their opinions about the particular time when *Baptism* was *necessary*.—Now, the *lawfulness* of *Infant-Baptism*, or it's *validity*, is all that we need contend for in this debate. And *this*, as will be shewn, *Tertullian* himself allowed ; and not only so, but in some cases he held it to be *necessary*, though in *other* cases he thought it *lawful*, and *expedient* to defer the *Baptism* of children for a time. *Gregory Nazianzen*, as we have observed before, was of the same opinion : And so, the *Antipædo-baptists* can claim neither the one, nor the other of them to their party.——But says Dr. *Gill* [c], “ *Tertullian* is the first man, that ever made mention of *Infant-Baptism*, that we know of ; and as he was the first, that spoke of it,

“ it, he at the same time spoke against it,
 “ &c.” Now, whether *Tertullian* is the
 first man, that ever *made mention* of Infant-
 Baptism, as the Doctor affirms, we shall con-
 sider hereafter. At present, let us enquire
 how far *Tertullian* spoke *against* Infant-Bap-
 tism ; and I doubt not, but it will appear,
 that what he said of Infant-Baptism doth not
 amount to an absolute *denial* of the thing, in
 point either of *fact*, or of *right*, but the con-
 trary. Let us examine his words with care,
 and attention, as we have them already trans-
 lated to our hands by Dr. *Wall* [d]. *Tertul-*
lian then says [e]— “ according to every one’s
 “ condition, and disposition, and also their
 “ age, the delaying of Baptism is *more profi-*
table, especially in the case of *little children*.
 “ For what need is there [] that the godfa-
 “ thers should be brought into danger? because
 “ they may either fail of their promises by
 “ death, or they may be mistaken by a
 “ child’s proving of wicked disposition. Our

“ Lord

[d] *Hist. of Inf. Bap.* p. 1. ch. 4. sect. 5.

[e] *Tertullian de baptismo.* c. 18. Says Dr. *Wall* *ibid.*
 sect. 13. “ It is plain, that St. *Austin*, and *Pelagius*, and
 “ several others, that managed the *Pelagian* controversy, had
 “ never seen *Tertullian’s* book of baptism.” But, when
Tertullian asks, “ Why doth their *innocent* age make such
 “ haste to the *forgiveness of sins*? ” his question implies two
 things: (1.) That Infants *were baptized*; as Doctor *Wall*
 justly observes. And (2.) That they *were, in fact*, accord-
 ing to the usage of the church, *baptized for the remission of*
sins. Therefore I can see no great necessity for the Doctor’s
 supposition; as these two facts remove the difficulties he
 mentions as the ground of it, at least in a good measure.

" Lord says indeed, *Do not forbid them to*
 " *come to me.* Therefore, let them come
 " when they are grown up: let them come
 " when they understand: when they are in-
 " structed whither it is they come; let them
 " be made christians when they can know
 " Christ. What need their *guiltless* age *make*
 " *such haste* to the *forgiveness* of *sins*? Men
 " will proceed more warily in worldly things;
 " and he that should not have earthly goods
 " committed to him, yet shall have heavenly.
 " Let them know how to desire this salvation,
 " that you may appear to have given to one
 " that asketh. For no less reason *unmarried*
 " persons ought to be kept off, who are likely
 " to come into temptation, as well those,
 " that never were married, upon account of
 " their coming to ripeness; as those in wi-
 " dowhood for the miss of their partner: un-
 " til they either marry, or be confirmed in
 " continence, &c."

As I have here copied Dr. *Wall*; so I have
 left a blank, in the same manner as he did,
 at the place where, in the older editions, these
 words come in, *si non tam necesse* [f], accord-
 ing to which *reading* *Tertullian's* meaning is
 plainly this [g], " What occasion is there,
 " except

[f] For *tam* I should read *tamen*, supposing it was for-
 merly written with an abbreviation, thus *tn*, (as the word is
 sometimes printed. Vid. *Russini Perorat.* in *Rom.* old Edit.)
 and the letter *n* mistaken for an *m* by the transcriber.

[g] *Quid enim necesse est, si non tam [vel tamen] necesse,*
sponsores,

" except in case of necessity, that the sponsors,
 " &c." This being premised, I proceed to
 observe (1.) The words of *Tertullian* seem fairly
 to imply, that Infant-Baptism was not only
 moved for, but actually practised in his time.
 " For when he says, *Why does that innocent*
 " *age make such haste, &c.* His words shew
 " the matter of fact to have been so, together
 " with his opinion against it [b]."
 But yet
 (2.) *Tertullian* doth not absolutely condemn
 Infant-Baptism as *unlawful*, or *unprofitable* ;
 he only gives his private opinion (wherein, for
 any thing that appears to the contrary, he
 was very singular as he was in some of his
 other notions) for the delay of Baptism, as
more profitable, not only in children, but in
 the adult also. Particularly, he was for hav-
 ing the Baptism of *young women* deferred 'till
 marriage, as well as of *widows, &c.* And
 will any one infer from hence, that it was a
novel custom in those days for unmarried
 persons of either sex, men or women, to be baptiz-
 ed? But, you might as well infer *this*, as con-
 clude from the words of *Tertullian* that Infant-
 Baptism was a *novel custom* in his time. (3.) If
 (as some learned writers have suggested [i])
 the words of *Tertullian* may reasonably be in-
 terpreted

sponsores, &c. The turn of expression here is very agreeable
 to *Tertullian's* stile, and manner; tho' Dr. Gale is pleased to
 censure it. *Reflections on Wall's history, &c.* p. 511.

[b] *Wall ibid. sect. 9.*

[i] *Mr. Steven Marshall. Answer to Mr. Tombes Examen.*
p. 36, 37.

terpreted of the Infants of Infidels; then, however his reasoning may seem to conclude, his advice about delaying Baptism can relate only to such children. In relation to those Infants, whose parents, one or both, were christians, he allows them a *prerogative*; or priviledge, by *birth*, and *institution* [k], above the children of heathens, referring to the words of St. Paul [l]: *For the unbelieving husband is sanctified by the wife, &c.* which by the way shews, that the construction, which the Antipædo-baptists put upon those words, is a *novel* interpretation, when they understand the *sanctification*, there spoken of, as denoting lawful wedlock, or cohabitation, and by the *holiness* of the children, so procreated, only their *legitimacy* [m]. For surely *Tertullian* did not suppose all the children of heathens to be *bastards*. However, he represents the children of idolaters as *born with an evil genius*; but the children of christians, as *holy by birth and institution*: i. e. as *candidates for holiness by birth*, and as *made holy by Baptism*: for so he afterward explains the matter. Therefore, it doth not certainly appear, that *Tertullian* was for having the Baptism

[k] Adeo nulla ferè nativitas munda est, utique Ethniconum. Hinc enim et apostolus ex sanctificato alterutro sexu sanctos procreari ait: tam ex seminis prærogativâ, quam ex institutionis disciplinâ: coeterum, inquit, immundi nascerentur, &c. *Tertullian. de anima. c. 39, &c.*

[l] 1 Cor. vii. 14.

[m] See Dr. Gill's commentary in loc, &c.

tism of *Believers* children delayed at all; and much less do his words imply any such *custom*. But, (4.) Whoever these Infants were, he was not *absolutely* against their Baptism; but, on the contrary, allowed of it in *case of necessity*. Nay, in this case, “ he pronounced “ him guilty of murder, who should refuse “ it to any. He held that Baptism was so “ necessary for all, that even *laymen* should “ administer it, when a *clergyman* could not “ be had, rather than any one should *die* “ *without it* [n].” Therefore *Tertullian* was properly no *Antipædo-baptist*; for he allowed, and even required Infants to be baptized in *case of necessity*, or *danger of death*. (5.) To what hath been said, I shall add two considerations to prove, that *Tertullian* himself looked upon *Infant-Baptism*, as no *human*, or *late invention*, but a *scripture institution*; though left at large, where no urgent necessity, or immediate danger appeared, and not limited, as *circumcision* was, to any particular day. (1.) Those words of Christ [o], *Except a man be born of water, and of the spirit*, &c. I say, these words *Tertullian* understood of *Baptism*, and from thence inferred it to be necessary to salvation [p]. Thus, he put that very construction upon the text, which, as

L the

[n] *Tertullian. de bapt. c. 17.* [o] *John i. 5.*

[p] *Cum vero præscribitur nemini sine baptismo competere salutem, ex illâ maxime pronunciatione Domini, qui ait, nisi natus ex aquâ quis erit, &c. Tertul. de bapt. c. 12.*

the Antipædo-baptists pretend [q], gave rise to the practice of Infant-Baptism. Therefore, they cannot fairly deny, that it was practised in the time of *Tertullian*, that it was then practised as a *scripture institution*, and that *Tertullian* himself considered it under this notion; at least, if they allow, that he believed Infant-salvation. (2.) When he produces sundry instances of *unwritten customs* in another *treatise*, and methodically begins with the administration of Baptism [r]; *Tertullian* makes no mention of *Infant-Baptism*, (tho' he mentions other things of less moment) as any of those *unwritten customs*. From whence one of these two things naturally follows, either that Infant-Baptism was not practised at that time; or that he looked upon it as a *written custom*; that is to say, a custom founded upon the *written rule of God's word*, and consequently a *scripture institution*. But the former supposition hath been proved to be false from his book of Baptism, which was written *before* [s]; and so the latter must be true.

Having given Dr. *Gill*, I hope, *proper satisfaction* upon *this point*; we are now at leisure to attend to his *other assertion*, viz. "that *Tertullian* is the first man, that ever made mention of *Infant-Baptism*, that we know of." — Upon which I observe, that those words

[q] *Mr. Stennet. Answer to Russen.* p. 77.

[r] *De corona militis.* [s] *Vid. Dupin Hist. Eccles.*

words are *equivocal*, and must be understood with caution ; for, other writers, before *Tertullian*, speak of the *same thing*, though not precisely in the same *terms*. And if Dr. Gill will not be so candid, as to admit of this distinction ; I wish he would be so kind as to inform us, who was the first man, that ever made mention of *original sin*, e. g. that is, used this very *term*, or phrase, *peccatum originis* : to instance in no other particulars, as I might in several, which the Doctor holds by no better tenure, than what depends upon the distinction aforesaid. Have we not already seen, that *Origen*, his cotemporary, though somewhat younger than *Tertullian*, says of *Infant-Baptism*, that it was a *custom*, a *tradition*, or *institution*, which the church derived from the apostles ? And how could *Origen* know this, but by the testimony of other writers ? Therefore, whatever we know of the matter (and indeed we know very little of the authors, that lived in those days, so few of them now being extant) we have no room to doubt, that other writers before *Tertullian* (the sacred writers are out of the present question) had made mention of *Infant-Baptism* as the *usage* and *practice* of the christian church derived from the apostles, and consequently as what had obtained from the begining. Accordingly, *Clemens Alexandrinus*, *Tertullian's* senior, plainly refers to *Infant-Baptism* under

that notion, saying [t] "If any one be by
 " trade a fisher-man, he will do well to think
 " of an apostle, and the children taken out
 " of the water." — "An apostle's taking,
 " drawing, or lifting, *a child out of the water*,
 " cannot refer to any thing, that I can think
 " of, but the *baptizing* of it :" says Dr.
Wall [u]. And so say I too ; being the
 more confirmed in this sentiment, by a passage
 in *Tertullian* [w], where he compares baptized
 persons to *little fishes* ; and so points out the
 apt propriety of the sign, or *seal*, which *Cle-
 mens Alexandrinus* proposes to fisher-men :
 and by his mentioning an *apostle* in the case,
 it evidently appears, that this antient writer
 looked upon Infant-Baptism as an *apostolical
 practice*.

Come we now to *Irenæus*, who flourished
 about A. D. 167, thirty years or more before
Tertullian. The words, usually cited in this
 debate from *Irenæus*, will appear to contain a
 clear testimony to Infant-Baptism, if persons
 could, and would consider them without
 prejudice, and prepossession. For he says of
 Christ [x], "that he came to save all by him-
 " self ; all I say, that by him are *born again*
 " unto God, Infants, and little children, youths,
 " and older men." Upon which the learned

Feu-

[t] *Pædagog.* lib. 3. cap. ii.

[u] *Wall's Defence, &c.* Appendix. p. 9.

[w] *Sed nos pisciculi — in aquâ nascamur.* *Tertullian.*
de baptismo.

[x] *Iren.* lib. 2. cap. 39.

Feuardentius hath this remark ; “ that by the “ name of *regeneration*, according to the “ phrase of Christ, and of his apostles, he “ understands *Baptism*, clearly confirming “ the apostolical tradition concerning the “ *Baptism of Infants*.” Let us now have the patience to hear, what Dr. *Gill*, after others, hath objected against this testimony of *Irenæus*. “ The passage (says he [y]) is only “ a translation of *Irenæus*, and not expressed “ in his own original words.” Again [z] : “ It is only a translation, as almost all his “ works be, and a very foolish, uncouth, and “ barbarous one.”—But yet, the doctor doth not pretend to say, and much less attempt to prove, that it is a *wrong*, or *false* translation ; which he should have done, if he would have said any thing to the purpose. It is observed by a learned and judicious writer [a], “ that the old translation, which we have of “ *Irenæus* is close, and unpolite, and for that “ reason may often discover to us the *origi-* “ *nal*, as might easily be shewed in a multi- “ tude of places.” And thus, the *coarseness* of the translation, objected by Dr. *Gill*, is really an argument in favour of it’s truth, and fidelity.— But, he adds [b], “ and the “ chapter,

[y] *Divine Right of Inf. Bap. examined, &c.* p. 22.

[z] *Argument from apost. tradit.* p. 14.

[a] *Jortin. Disc. 1. on the Christian Relig.* Compare *Wali’s Defence, &c.* p. 315, 316.

[b] *Ubi supra.*

“ chapter, from whence it is taken, is by
 “ *some* learned men judged to be spurious.”
 Which words imply, that *all* learned men do
 not judge so; and the Doctor must allow us,
 to think, that at least *one* learned man hath
 said what is sufficient to prove the contrary,
 until Dr. *Wall's* answer to Dr. *Gale* upon this
 head [*c*] hath received a proper reply. But
 this is a common artifice with writers in *dis-
 tress*, when they meet with any thing, which
 they cannot reconcile with their own dear
 prejudices, and prepossessions, to raise ground-
 less scruples, and suspicions about it. Thus,
Charles Blackwood, that doughty champion,
 who bravely undertook the *storming* of *Anti-
 christ*, would needs have St. *Cyprian's* epistle
 to *Fidus*, though so often quoted by St. *Aus-
 tin*, be *suspected to be spurious* [*d*]; (because,
 I suppose, it speaks too plainly for *him* of *In-
 fant-Baptism*) but upon the weakest grounds,
 that can be. No more solid, or substantial
 is Dr. *Gill's* following remark upon the passage
 under consideration [*e*]. “ It is but a *single*
 “ passage out of him (as if *Irenæus* could
 “ not mention *Infant-Baptism* at all, if he
 “ speaks of it but once) and that depends
 “ upon a *single word*, the signification of
 “ which is *doubtful* at the best.” — So much
 the better, if there is but *one* word in the
 sentence

[*c*] *Wall's Defence, &c.* p. 280, &c.

[*d*] *Blackwood. Storming of Antichrist.* p. 30.

[*e*] *Ubi supra.*

sentence of doubtful signification! But, worthy Doctor, why is the signification even of *this* word so very doubtful? Hath not Dr. *Wall* [f] produced abundant evidence, to prove, that the antients commonly spoke of Baptism under the notion of *regeneration*? Nay, what better evidence can be desired, than the poor evasions, and pitiful shifts, to which Dr. *Gale* was reduced in vainly attempting to prove the contrary; and whereby he justly merited the character given of him, viz. *an everlasting caviller against things, that are plain* [g]? We have seen before, that *Tertullian*, cotemporary with *Irenæus*, understood the words of Christ John iii. 5. of Baptism. He also says that christians *are born in water*, like fishes; and to what can this refer, but Baptism? Thus, he speaks of Baptism under the notion of regeneration:— *Clemens Alexandrinus* also speaks of christians being born, or *begotten of the womb of water*. *Γεγενηθεὶς ἐκ μήτρας υδατος.*—*Genuit ex matrice aquae.* *Strom.* l. 4. And a like notion *Tertullian* mentions, as maintained by the *heathens* [h]: no doubt long before the time of *Irenæus*. But, we need not have recourse to the *heathens*: several christian writers, who lived *with*, or *before* *Irenæus*, speak the same language; as will be shewn here-

[f] History of Inf. Bap. p. 2. ch. 6. and Defence p. 318, &c. Appendix. p. 3. &c.

[g] *Wall's Defence*, &c. p. 339.

[h] *Tertullian de baptismo*, cap. 5.

hereafter. At present, I shall only remind Dr. *Gill* of what he hath himself alledged [i] concerning the antiquity of the “*custom* of “ giving a mixture of *milk* and *honey* to a per-“ son just baptized.” For, as *milk* and *honey* were the food of Infants; so the giving of this mixture to a *person just baptized*, was a signification, or symbolical sign of his being *new-born*, or born again [k]. Now, the Doctor says [l], even *Barnabas*, a companion of the apostle *Paul*, is *thought* to refer to this practice, in an epistle of his still extant [m]. Let me ask then; doth Dr. *Gill* himself really *think* so; or doth he not? If he doth not; Why did he alledge *this* as a proof of the high antiquity of that custom? On the other hand, if the Doctor is of that opinion; if he looks upon the epistle of *Barnabas* to be genuine, and supposes it to refer to the custom of giving a mixture of *milk*, and *honey* to a person just baptized: then must he retract his own words, when he adds [n], “ nor had it as yet “ obtained among the antients, to use the “ words *regenerated*, and *regeneration*, for “ *baptized*,

[i] Argument from apost. tradit. p. 37.

[b] Hieronym. *adv. Luciferianos*. Bochart. *Hierozoic. lib.*

4. *cap. 12.*

[l] *Ibid.* [m] *C. 5.*

[n] *Ibid. p. 14.* Dr. *Gale* also says (Reflections on Wall’s history, &c. p. 489.) “ I do not believe it (i. e. the word *re-generation*) is ever so much as once used in the antientest times for baptism, at least not till their *zeal for Infant-Baptism* betrayed them into that absurdity, which was not near the time of St. *Irenæus*.” — But, a *zeal for Infant-Baptism* will prove, upon his hypothesis, much earlier than the Doctor pretends.

“ *baptized*, and *baptism*.”—Let us now return to *Irenæus*; and by examining another passage, or two in *this* antient writer, it will manifestly appear, that he himself used the words *regenerated* and *regeneration* in the sense contended for. In one place [o] he speaks thus; “ And again, giving the power “ of *regeneration* unto God to his disciples, he “ said unto them, *Go, and teach all nations,* “ *baptizing them in the name of the Father,* “ *and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost.*” This passage seems too plain to need any comment, or to be capable of any evasion. In another place [p], *Irenæus* mentions by name, “ the *Baptism* of *regeneration* to God.”—The Doctor cannot say of *this* passage, that it is only a *translation* of *Irenæus*; for, we have it *expressed in his own original words*, if that will please him. Well then! *Irenæus* expressly speaks of the *Baptism* of *regeneration* unto God, and of *Infants* being *regenerated* unto God. From whence it is natural for any man of plain sense, to infer that *Infants* were *baptized*.—But says the Doctor [q] “ the true “ sense of *Irenæus* seems to be *this*, that

M “ Christ

[o] *Et iterum potestatem regenerationis in Deum demandans discipulis, dicebat eis: Eunte docete omnes gentes, baptizantes eos in nomine Patris, et Filii, et Spiritus Sancti.* *Iren.* lib. 3. cap. 19.

[p] —τὸν βαπτισμὸν τοῦ εἰς θεὸν ἀναγεννήσεως, i. e. *baptisnatis ejus, quæ est in Deum regenerationis.* *Iren. lib. 14 cap. 18.*

[q] *Divine right of Inf. Bap. examined, &c. p. 23.*

“ Christ came to save all, that are regenerated by his grace and spirit, and none but they, according to his own words. John iii. 3, 5.” Now, this is granting all we desire, *viz.* that the words of *Irenæus* refer to the words of Christ in those texts of scripture, particularly the last. For, this is plainly giving up the point; as those words were always [r], and I think rightly [s], understood of Baptism by the antient christian writers.

— But the Doctor is not yet easy; he says, that “ to understand *Irenæus* as speaking of Baptism, is to make him at least to suggest a doctrine, which is absolutely false, as if Christ came to save *all*, and *only* such, who are baptized unto God.” The like objection is made by another learned writer [t], who should have understood the sentiments and language of the primitive Fathers better. Did not he know, that *Tertullian* as well as St. *Austin*, &c. spoke of Baptism as necessary to salvation? How came the *ecclesiastical historian* then to forget, that it is agreeable to the *ecclesiastical stile*, to understand *Irenæus* also as speaking of Baptism under the same notion?

And

[r] See Wall’s *History*, &c. p. 2. ch. 6.

[s] The words of Christ, *Except a man be born of water, and of the spirit, &c.* are parallel to the words of St. Paul, Tit. iii. 5. by the *washing* of regeneration, and renewing of the Holy Ghost. And those, who would confine the words wholly to *spiritual baptism*, put a manifest force upon them, at the expence of a *tautology*: which is Dr. *Gill’s* way. See his *commentary*, &c. Conf. Mar. xvi. 16.

[t] *J. Cleric. Hist. Eccles. ann. 180. sect. 33.*

And thus, what is urged as an objection, is really a confirmation of the given sense of *Irenæus*: which cannot be disproved by the consequence drawn from it, unless the infallibility of *Irenæus* in points of *doctrine* be first established. Besides, hath not the *Oracle of truth* himself declared [u]? “ He that believeth, and is baptized, shall be saved.” And is not this the same kind of language, that we suppose *Irenæus* to speak, so far as relates to *Baptism*? I hope, Dr. *Gill* will not here say, that “ to understand *Christ* as speaking of “ *Baptism*, is to make him at least to suggest “ a doctrine, which is absolutely false, &c.” But, if the words of *Christ* admit of a qualified sense; so do the words of *Irenæus*. There is nothing therefore in his manner of expression, that argues that he doth not speak of *Baptism*, when he speaks of Infants *being regenerated* unto God; but the contrary. For, his way of speaking, thus understood, is quite agreeable to the *ecclesiastical stile*, and to *scripture language* also. So much then for the testimony, the plain unexceptionable testimony, of *Irenæus* for the practice of Infant-Baptism. And as this antient writer flourished about sixty seven years after the apostles, so that he may well be supposed, as he is said, to have been born some time before the death of St. *John*: his testimony therefore carries up the

evidence for Infant-Baptism very near to the apostolic age.

But farther to corroborate this evidence, let us proceed to *Justin Martyr*, whose time is fixed only forty years after the apostles. And the better to connect our observations on him with our remarks on *Irenæus*; we shall begin with a passage, where *Justin Martyr* plainly enough speaks of Baptism under the notion of *regeneration*, though he is describing to the heathens the manner of adult-baptism only, having no occasion to descend to any farther particulars: nor do we alledge the passage as a proof of Infant-Baptism directly; but only to shew that this antient writer also used the word *regeneration*, so as to connote Baptism, and thereby confirms the sense already given of the words of *Irenæus*. *Justin Martyr* then says [w], “ We bring them “ (viz. the *new-converts*) to some place, where “ there is water; and they are *regenerated* by “ the same way of *regeneration* by which we “ were *regenerated*: for they are washed with “ water in the name of God the Father and “ Lord of all things, and of our Saviour *Jesus Christ*, and of the Holy Spirit. For, “ Christ says [x], unless you be *regenerated*, you “ cannot enter into the kingdom of heaven, &c.” Thus, as *Justin Martyr* useth the term *regeneration*, so he understands these words of our Saviour,

Saviour, of *Baptism*. Therefore, though he here describes the manner of administering *Baptism* only to the *adult*, as we are often told ; yet his words cannot be thought to exclude the *Baptism of Infants* in those days : because, we see, that construction of our Saviour's words did *then* obtain, which, as the Anti-pædo-baptists themselves say, *introduced Infant-Baptism into the christian church*. So little reason had Dr. *Gill* to say, speaking of the time of *Irenæus*, near thirty years younger than *Justin Martyr*, “ nor had it as yet obtained “ among the antients to use the words *rege-
nerated*, and *regeneration*, for *baptized*, “ and *Baptism* ! ” As for Dr. *Gale*’s quibbles upon this head, I scarce need to refer the Reader to Dr. *Wall*’s reply [y] for a proper answer ; the plain words of *Justin Martyr*, above cited, being a sufficient answer of themselves.

The next passage I shall mention is in his *Dialogue with Trypho the Jew* [z] ; where *Justin Martyr* says that concerning the influence and effect of *Adam*’s sin upon mankind, which the antient writers represent as the ground and reason of *Infant-Baptism*. In the same book he speaks of *Baptism* being to christians in the room of *circumcision* ; and so points out the analogy between these two initiatory rites. Dr. *Wall* hath quoted both

[y] *Wall's Defence, &c. p. 277.*

[z] *J. Martyr Dialog. cum Trypho, &c.*

both the passages at large, and made proper reflections upon them [a]. To him therefore I shall refer the curious and inquisitive Reader: for I hasten to another passage in *Justin Martyr*, upon which I must dwell awhile longer. *Justin Martyr* then says [b].

“ Several persons among us, of both sexes, of
 “ sixty, and seventy years of age, οἱ ἐν παιδῶν
 “ ἐμαθητευθησαν τῷ χριστῷ, who were disciplined
 “ to Christ in their childhood, &c.” Dr. Gill
 renders the words thus [c], “ who from their
 “ childhood were instructed in Christ: for so
 “ (says he) the phrase, on which the whole
 “ depends, should be rendered, and not *dis-
 cipled*, or *proselyted to Christ*, which render-
 “ ing of the words as it is unjustifiable, so it
 “ would never have been thought of, had it not
 “ been to serve a turn.”—Now, by expressing
 himself thus, the Doctor seems to be aware,
 that the *turn* of Infant-Baptism *would be serv-
 ed*, if that construction of the word, ἐμαθη-
 τευθησαν, which he disallows, were admitted:
 and yet, if he also had not a turn to serve in
 his way, it is probable that he would never
 have thought of any other rendering of the
 word: nor can he justify his own sense of the
 phrase, ἐμαθητευθησαν τῷ χριστῷ, by any rule
 of grammar, or parallel example. e. g. “ *An-
 tiphon*, the son of *Sophilus*—μαθητευσας δὲ
 “ τῷ πατρὶ, was *discipled*, or a *disciple* to his
 “ father;”

[a] Hist. of Inf. Bap. p. 1. ch. 2.

[b] *Apol.* 2.

[c] Argument from ap. tradit. &c. p. 12.

“ father ;” says *Plutarch* [c]. But according to Dr. *Gill*’s rule of construction, we should say, *Antiphon* was *instructed in his father*. And would this be good sense, or a proper way of speaking ? The Doctor himself, when perhaps he was off his guard, and *had no turn to serve*, sometimes supposed, that in the *christian* sense of the word, *disciple*, it includes *Baptism*. For, says he [d], “ The apostle takes it for granted, that they were *baptized*, since they were not only believers, but *disciples*.” And this sense of the word, as including the idea of *Baptism*, is confirmed by the following passage [e] ; “ When they had *preached* the gospel to that city, and μαθητευσαντες taught (*discipled*) many, &c.” that is, made many *disciples*. By this expression the sacred writer must intend something more than bare *instruction* ; otherwise it is a mere *tautology*. And what can this something more be, but *baptizing* them ? Dr. *Gill* himself being judge. Therefore, since according to the *christian* sense of the word in question, it comprehends *Baptism*, when *Justin Martyr* says of certain persons εἰς παιδῶν ἐμαθητευθησαν τῷ χριστῷ ; his words imply that they were *baptized in* their infancy, or childhood : for, the *Baptism* of any persons being not a *continued*, but one single transi-

ent

[c] *Plutarc. de vit. decem Rhet. Op. Vol. 2. p. 832.*[d] Dr. *Gill*’s commentary in *Acta xix. 1, 3.*[e] *Acta xiv. 21.*

ent act, to speak of their being baptized *from* their childhood, would be improper [f]. We grant, the word, *disciple*, hath a reference to *teaching*, and instruction. But then, whereas the Antipædo-baptists pretend that all persons must be *first* taught before they are baptized; we, on the contrary maintain, that children rightly *may* be, and in fact *were*, baptized, and so far made disciples to Christ, in order to be taught, as a scholar is put to school, that he may learn.

With respect to the *matter of right* in this case, it is beyond the compass of my *present* design, to discuss the question in that view. However, as it may contribute something toward supporting the given sense of *Justin Martyr*; I shall here anticipate myself so far, as to offer some considerations upon the words of the *commission* [g]. “Go ye therefore, and “teach (*disciple*) all nations, *baptizing* them “in the name of the Father, and of the “Son, and of the Holy Ghost; *teaching* “them to observe all things whatsoever I “have commanded you, &c.”—Here, say the Antipædo-baptists, *teaching* is set before *baptizing*; and so, from hence they argue, and would conclude, that *all* persons must be taught, before they are baptized. But, from a strict, and impartial examination of the words of the commission, the contrary will appear

[f] See Wall's Defence, &c. p. 280.

[g] Mat. xxviii. 19, 20.

appear to be true, and that *baptizing* is really set before *teaching*, in the proper order of words ; though I shall not argue from thence, that *all* persons must be baptized, before they are taught, but only that there is no ground from the words of the commission for the contrary supposition. For (1.) we have the general matter of the commission laid down in these words ; *Go ye and disciple*, or *proselyte*, *all nations*. For so, I insist, the original word ought to be rendered, to express its true meaning, and to avoid a *tautology* ; not *teach* *all nations* ; as *teaching* is mentioned afterward by a more proper, and known term, *διδάσκοντες* [b]. Accordingly, thus it is, that our translators have very properly rendered the word in another place of the same gospel [i]. Nor can Dr. *Gill*, rememb'ring his own observation above mentioned, disallow, how much soever he may *dislike*, this interpretation ; or confine the sense of the word to mere *teaching*, but at the expence of a palpable self-contradiction. Therefore, *discipling* is a general, and comprehensive term, including both *teaching*, and *baptizing*. For observe (2.) the particular method of executing this commission, appointed in *two directions* ; viz. *baptizing*, and *teaching* : that is to say, *by baptizing*, and *by teaching* : for, the

N

Greeks

[b] See *Wall's Defence*, &c. p. 135, 136.[i] *Mat. xxvii. 57.*

Greeks use the *participles* for *gerunds* [k]. Our learned Doctor over-acts the *grammarian*, when he says [l], “ the antecedent to the “ *relative them* (after *baptizing*) cannot be *all* “ *nations*, ——but *disciples*, &c.” The reason he gives for it, is of no force at all, viz. the disagreement of *gender*. Such inaccuracies, or *atticisms* [m], are not uncommon. The Doctor may find the same construction in other places [n], yea, the very same phrase [o]. And let me ask him, what is the antecedent to the second *them*? (after *teaching*) Will he say, as before, *disciples*? Then, by his own confession, *disciples* are *persons to be taught*! I give the Doctor free liberty, to chuse his own antecedent. And whether it be *all nations*, or *disciples*; this is plain, that *baptizing* is set before *teaching* in the express words of the commission. ——Therefore, to return to *Justin Martyr*, no sufficient reason appears, why the aged persons, mentioned by him, as having been *discipled to Christ in*, or *from their childhood*, may not be supposed, to have been made *disciples to Christ in* their infancy by *Baptism*, and afterwards *taught from* their infancy; according to that observation of the learned

[k] *Vid. Spanham. Dubia Evang. in loc.*

[l] *Divine right of Inf. Bap. &c. p. 79.*

[m] The construction of a *relative* is of the same nature with that of an *adjective*; concerning which the rule is: *poticè, et atticè, nec casu, nec genere, nec numero consentit.*

[n] *2 Kings. xvii. 41, 70. Acts xv. 17.*

[o] *Mat. xxv. 32.*

learned Dr. *Lightfoot* [p], “ Baptism makes “ disciples, and discipling sets the way to be “ taught.” This to me appears to give us the full import of *Justin Martyr*’s phrase. And, considering the time, when he writ, the persons, of whom he speaks, must have been *discipled to Christ*, and consequently baptized, in the apostolic age, and near the middle of it [q].

I shall not here insist upon the *questions* and *answers* to the *Orthodox*; a book which goes under the name of *Justin Martyr*, but is the work of a later author, in the fourth century perhaps [r]. However, Infant-Baptism is there spoken of, as a thing vulgarly known, and practised in the christian church, and the right of children to Baptism on the foot of the faith of those, that present them, is plainly, and positively asserted [s]. We may rank this book in the same class with the *Apostolical Constitutions*, which expressly order the Baptism of Infants [t]. And so, from both we may conclude, that Infant-Baptism was practised in the Greek church; a fact which the Antipædo-baptists have sometimes denied.

N 2 Perhaps,

[p] Sermon on Matth. xxviii. 19. Op. Vol. 2. p. 1124. This is according to the rule, *Baptize your children, and bring them up in the nurture and admonition of the Lord.* Apost. Constitut. ubi infra.

[q] See the Baptism of Infants, a reasonable service. p. 32.

[r] *Vid. Quest. 74, 126, &c.*

[s] *Quest. & Respons. 56.*

[t] *Apost. Constitut. lib. 6. cap. 15.*

Perhaps, according to my proposed method, I should have mentioned the *Recognitions* before *Justin Martyr* in order. However, says the learned and laborious Mr. *Bingham* [u], “ It is an antient writing of “ the same age with *Justin Martyr*, men- “ tioned by *Origen* in his *Philocalia*, and by “ some ascribed to *Bardesenes Syrus*, who “ lived about the middle of the second cen- “ tury. This author speaks of the necessity “ of Baptism in the same style, as *Justin* “ *Martyr* did, &c. — So that if Infant-Bap- “ tism was founded, as *Salmasius* pleads, up- “ on the opinion of the necessity of Baptism “ to salvation; this author must be an assertor “ of Infant-Baptism; because he was unde- “ niably an assertor of the general necessity “ of Baptism to salvation [w].

To conclude in the words of the same author [w]. “ The most antient writer, that “ we have is *Clemens Romanus*, who lived in “ the time of the apostles. And he, though “ he doth not directly mention Infant-Bap- “ tism, yet says a thing, that by consequence “ proves it. For, he makes Infants liable to “ original sin, which in effect is to say, that “ they have need of Baptism to purge it “ away, &c [x]. — *Hermes Pastor* lived “ about

[u] *Antiquities of the christian ch.* B. xi. ch. 4. sect. 8.

[w] *Clement. Recognit. lib. 6.*

[w] *Bingham antiqu. ibid. sect. 6.*

[x] *Clemens Roman. Ep. 1. ad Corinth.*

“ about the same time with *Clemens*, and hath
 “ several passages to shew the general necessi-
 “ ty of *water*, that is Baptism, to save men,
 “ &c [x]. — Therefore, they who represent
 “ this doctrine of the necessity of Baptism
 “ as a novelty, or an error, first introduced
 “ into the church in the age of St. *Austin*
 “ against the *Pelagian* hereticks; do mani-
 “ fest wrong both to the doctrine itself, and
 “ to St. *Austin*, and to the antients, who
 “ embraced, and delivered the same before
 “ him.”

Thus, from the begining of the *fifth* century backward, either expressly, or in respect to the common *grounds* of it (those very grounds upon which the Antipædo-baptists themselves say, it was founded) we have traced up the practice of Infant-Baptism to the time of the apostles [y]. (And it is only the *fact* itself, as attested by the antient *writers*, not their *reasonings* about it, in which we are concerned at present) Our testimonies upon this head might have been expected to be more full for the *first* ages, if there had *then* been any *controversy* about Infant-Baptism, and

[x] *Hermes Pastor* lib. 1. & 3. See *Wall's History*, &c. p. 1. ch. 1. and *Defence*. ch. xi.

[y] *Quod autem apud simplicem vulgum disseminant, longam annorum seriem, post Christi resurrectionem, præterisse, quibus incognitus erat pædo-baptismus; in eo fædissime mentiuntur: siquidem nullus scriptor tam vetustus, qui non ejus originem ad apostolorum seculum pro certo referat.* J. Calvin. *Instit.* lib. 4. cap. 16. sect. 8.

and we had now a greater number of primitive writers extant. So that what our *evidence* may seem to lose in *one* view, it gains in another. The main question is, on which side the *preponderating* evidence lies. And to judge of this, I desire the Reader to consider, that in all the forementioned period the Antipædo-baptists cannot produce one single author to *disprove* the fact [y]. For, the first man, that ever suggested any thing of that kind, was *Wilfrid Strabo*, a writer in the ninth century; and what he says is grounded upon a palpable mistake. Because, he builds his opinion, against the early practice of Infant-Baptism, upon no historical memoirs, or authentic testimony; but only on a passage in St. *Austin's* book of *Confessions*, which speaks of his being baptized at adult-age. Nothing at all to the purpose! For, from the same book of St. *Austin* we also learn, that, when he was born, his *father* was a heathen [z]. And, if his *mother* was then

[y] " Mr. *Gale* says, *Had it been the settled practice, &c.*
 " *it cannot be imagined*, that *Tertullian* *should venture to*
 " *oppose it*. Why not? Why might not he have the confi-
 " *dence*, and *self opinion*, that Mr. *Gale* has now, when it
 " is undoubtedly the settled practice? He knows well enough
 " (though he would conceal it from any ignorant Reader) that,
 " That is *Tertullian's* character among all men; to oppose
 " his singular opinions to the practice, and tenets of the
 " church of his time, &c." *Wall's Defence* p. 361.

[z] See *Marshall's Defence of Inf. Bap.* in answer to *Tombes*. p. 47. and *Wall's history, &c.* p. 2. ch. 3. sect. ii. and ch. 2. sect. 2.

then a christian ; his being not *baptized* in infancy can no more prove, that Infant-Baptism was not the common practice of the *christian* church at that time (as we know it was by St. *Austin's* own testimony) than *Timothy's* not being *circumcised* in infancy (whose father was a *Greek*, and his mother a *Jewess* [a]) is any proof that Infant-circumcision was not then the common practice of the *Jewish* church. Wherefore to conclude all in the words of St. *Augustin*, in his epistle to St. *Jerome*, *contra Ecclesiae fundatissimum morem* nemo sentiat, i. e. " let no body think " contrary to the most firmly established custom " of the church."

[a] *Act* xvi. 1, 3.

F I N I S.

A D V E R T I S E M E N T.

THIS Defence of the Antiquity is designed to prepare the Way for the Defence of the Authority of Infant-Baptism, in Answer to the common Objections against it.

BOOKS Printed and Sold by J. WAUGH at
the Turk's Head in Lombard-Street.

I. **T**H E Dissenting Gentleman's THREE LETTERS, with a POSTSCRIPT, in Answer to the Reverend Mr. *White's* THREE LETTERS; in which a Separation from the Establishment is fully justified; the Charge of Schism is refuted and retorted; and the Church of *England* and the Church of *Jesus Christ*, are impartially compared, and found to be Constitutions of a quite different Nature. The LETTERS and POSTSCRIPT may be had separate.

II. The BAPTISM of INFANTS, a Reasonable Service; founded upon Scripture, and undoubted Apostolic Tradition: In which its Moral Purposes and Use in Religion are shewn.

III. DIPPING not the only Scriptural and Primitive Manner of Baptizing: And supposing it were, yet a strict Adherence to it not obligatory on us.

IV. EUROCLYDON: Or, the Dangers of the Sea considered and improved, in some Reflections on St. Paul's Voyage and Shipwreck, *Acts xvii.*

V. LIBERTY and LOYALTY: Or, a Defence and Explication of the Subjection to the present Government, upon the Principles of the Revolution.

VI. DIVINE ORACLES: Or, the Sufficiency of the Holy Scriptures, as a Rule of Religion, asserted, according to the sixth Article of the Church of *England*. And the concurrent Testimony of Scripture and the Fathers, in Behalf of Tradition, discussed; in Answer to a Book intitled, a full, true and comprehensive View of Christianity, &c. during the four first Centuries—laid down in two Catechisms.

VII. HOLY ORDERS: Or, an Essay on Ordination.

